A CONFUTATION OF Infants Baptiſme,

Or an Anſwer,
To a *Treatice* written by GEORG PHILLIPS, of *Watterto wne* in *New England*, in the defence of Infants BAPTISME, denying the true Church to be formed by *Baptiſme*, and affirming it to be formed by a Covenant acted by a company of beleivers, to become one, and anothers amongſt themſelves.

WHEREIN,
Is plainely diſcovered that neither Infants *Baptiſme*, nor yet ſuch a covenant acted, can be Gods ordinance appointed by him for any ſuch end, as to conſtitute true viſable Churches:

As alſo that *Baptiſme* of beleevers, and that only is Gods ordinance whereby true viſible Churches are rightly conſtituted and ſtated in their true being.

By THOMAS LAMBE.

Then ſaid Peter repent and be baptiſed every one of you in the name of Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſinnes, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt, Act. 2. 38.
He that beleeveth and is baptiſed ſhall be ſaved, Mar. 16. 16.
Then they that gladly received his word were baptiſed, and the ſame day there were added to the Church three thouſand ſoules, Act. 2. 41.
And as ſoone as they beleived Philip *preaching the things concerning the Kingdome of God, and the name of Ieſus, they were baptiſed both men and women*, Act. 8. 12.

Printed in the yeare, 1643.

TO THE

Vnpartiall Reader, that desireth truth in the love of it, Grace and Peace be multiplyed in this life with Salvation, and happinesse in the life to come through JESVS CHRIST.

AS *Religion is the meanes of Gods glory and mans happines, so ought it to be the principall care, study & endeavour of all how to exercise themselvs therin, so as they may accomplish the proposed end; but as all things that are excellent in nature have their like; which evill minded men doe many times make use of, to deceive, cozen and cheate with the false colourable shew, which these things have with those that are more excellent; even so religion which is the most excellent means in the world, tending to the most excellent end [illegible] (viz.) the glory of the great God, and the eternall salvation of soule and body at the day of judgement, is not without the like false colorable shew, wherwith Satan & his ministers doe deceive, cheate, and cozen poore soules, and hereof it comes to passe, that men doe after a certaine manner take chaffe for wheat, drosse for Gold, errour for truth, mans devises for Gods pure Ordinances; and as errour in every subject is dangerous, according to the nature of every Subject about which it is conversant: so in religion it is most dangerous, being a subject of the greatest consequence that can be: because as it is a meanes of Gods glory and our salvation, so it must bee a true meanes tending to the accomplishment of the proposed end, or otherwise we shall not only misse the end propos-*

ed, but shall effect a quite contrary end, viz.) *the dishonour of God, and the damnation of our selves, even by the Religion which we observe; yea although we be never so zealous in it, and therefore it is of speciall concernment, that we take heed that the Religion which we doe observe be Gods appointment by his revealed word, it being his prerogative, to be author, institutor, framer, and appointer of all that service, which he will have men to performe unto him: and the reason is because Gods glory and mans happinesse is so united together, as the one is not without the other attainable by man, but only as man is led and guided by God in the use of such meanes as he hath appointed in his word; and for so much as Gods word doth set forth Christ to be the Mediatour, and principall meanes that God hath in wisedome and mercy appointed to glorifie himself in the salvation of man by; and all other meanes exercised in Religion, to bee used only in subordination to him, to the working of us unto faith in him, and the increase of the same; Hence these conclusions follow;*

First, That no action of Religion performed, though it be the thing that is expressely commanded, pleaseth God for it selfe.

Secondly, God requireth no action of Religion, to be performed without faith in the performer or subiect of the action.

Thirdly that God requireth that persons [illegible] taught to believe in Christ, as in an all sufficient meanes of glorifying Gods grace in our salvation.

Fourthly, that every action of Religion be performed in the name, power, authority and Commission of Jesus Christ.

Fifthly, that every action of Religion be performed by vertue of the grace of Christ, *received by faith,* for whatsoever is not of Faith is sin, and without Faith it is impossible to please God.

Sixtly, that every action of Religion should teach us the infirmity of our faith.

Seaventhly, that every action of Religion should be exercised as a meanes to strengthen our faith.

Eighthly,

Eighthly, that when actions of Religion are performed, and the performers have no faith in Chriſt, *thoſe actions are meanes to harden the heart againſt* Chriſt.

Ninthly, no action of Religion ought to be performed by any man, no not by the faithfull themſelves, if Chriſt *be not by the direction of his word the body (or rather the ſoule) of that action;*

And the reaſon of all this is, becauſe the end meaſures the meanes, and all the actions of Religion, being but meanes of ſetting forth of Chriſt Jeſus, *the Sonne of God to be the true meanes and mediatour betweene God and man, that God doth glorifie himſelfe in the ſalvation of man by, and this being the proper end why all the actions of Religion are to be performed: namely, to cauſe our underſtandings to ſee, know, and acknowledge the glory of Gods grace, ſhining through that his Sonne.*

And hereupon it is that the Order which Jeſus Chriſt *the Son of God, and great Prophet of his Church, hath preſcribed to effect Religion in the hearts and lives of men is this: that perſons ſhould be firſt taught by the powerfull preaching of the Goſpell, and glad tidings of grace and ſalvation, which by him is appointed to be preached to all Nations, or to every creature, that thereby all perſons being borne in ſinne and heires of death, might bee converted and borne againe by the Doctrine of grace, and made heires of eternall life, and when they believe and make profeſſion of faith, then and not before to be baptiſed upon ſuch profeſſion of faith, made in the name of the Father, who hath adopted them to be his children in the name of the Sonne, by whom they are reconciled, in the name of the Holy Ghoſt, by whom they are regenerated into the faith which they make profeſſion of: the end is, that thereby as by a Livery or badge, they may be diſtinguiſhed to belong to the Church of* Jeſus Chriſt, *who hath betruſted them with all his divine and ſpirituall Ordinances, as Election of Miniſters from amongſt themſelves, together with all divine adminiſtration, as a people capable*

pable thereof, and hath promised his presence with them, and his blessing upon them in the same, for the edification preservation and finall perseverance in the faith of the same Gospell of grace, even the salvation of their soules, and thus by the direction of Christ: true Religion is seated in the World as the true meanes of Gods glory and mans happinesse. Now Satan the Prince of darkn sse, as he is the Enemy of mankind, and seekes his destruction to the dishonour of God, so doth he labour in no meanes more than in the counterfeiting of Religion, which that he might the better effect the same: doth transforme himself into an Angell of light, and by his Ministers as though they were the ministers of righteousnes, or of Christ, pretend that Religion doth not thrive fast enough, nor members increase to the church so fast as they would have them: have therefore by their device perswaded people that as children were circumcised, so children of baptised persons ought to be baptized of the eight day, or at least betimes, and by these meanes have they made the Church very great, though it be not very good for they have made and compelled whole Nations, yea all to be outwardly religious, and whosoever would not be one with them in this their Religion, must neither buy nor sell, nor injoy bodily comforts while they live, and when they die must not be buried in the Christian buriall: and lest this Church thus stated, (although uncapable of all divine administrations in the true service and worship of God) should be left without all Religion, having none in their hearts; (I speake of the Church in relation to the constitution of it, consisting of baptised Infants, meere naturalists in which converts are meere accidents, and appertaine nothing to the nature of that Church state, which is of it self compleat without them) Satan by the Ministery of Antichrist hath devised a Liturgy, Masse, or Service-Booke, which doth direct them where, when, how to pray, and what to pray for having provided prayers ready made for them for all occasions, which hath been thought necessary: and likewise all other services are not

only

only there directed but therein provided, and ordered to be performed at all times for the whole service of the Church, which therefore is called Divine Service, (although there be nothing but humanity or worse in it) the performance of which as it may be without any faith, or spirituall gift, or grace from God *be compleatly done, and therefore fit for such a Church, so have all manner of persons in the Nation been compelled with great penall Lawes to be frequent at such service as if it had bin the only true holy spirituall service and worship of* God: *and yet all this while this is divine service only in name and not indeed; as the Church is a Church of* Christ *in name but not indeed and in truth as they have the Baptisme of* Christ *in name but not in deed and in truth, and thereupon are these Christians in name but not in deed and truth, and so all* Religion *is only nominall not reall, having great shew but no substance, a pitifull condition and to be bewayled and greatly lamented, and the cause of all this is Infants Baptisme, and the reason is evident, if we do not willingly shut our eyes against the manifest light, for whersoever* Religion *is exercised upon persons, before they are taught to believe in* Christ, *the errour is as it were in the center which proves infinite in the circumference, and wanting religion in the heart: first all what ever is done is but vanity, hypocrisie, a shadow without a substance, a body without a soule, a shell without a kernell, a name without the nature of the thing, the consideration of all, which miserable witchery and delusion I being greatly affected with, & conceiving these insuing lines which cost me much labour, to be profitable for the discovery of the same, in some measure thought it not meet to let them lie in obscurity, while I conceived others to have much need of them, & many of my deare friends did earnestly desire them the gratification, whereof I could not with modesty and reason tell how to deny, and being privy to my owne sincerity, that I had no base or by end: and last of all, and most of all being affected with the glory of the great GOD, and the salvation of the soules of*

men

men which is the best end of all, and knowing true Religion to be the direct meanes, and false Religion to be the greatest hinderance or contradiction thereunto, of which these ensueing lines are the proper Subject; I have in the goodnes of my cause adventured to put them forth to publike view, resolving to abide the hazard what ever can come unto me for the same being confident of these two conclusions: first that if any shall be offended at it without a cause, there can come no hurt to me by it, for whatsoever hurt is done to any person for well doing hurts the doer, but not the person to whom the hurt is done, because they doe but kick against pricks, and persecute Christ in his members, and Christs members in such a case save his life even in losing of it. Secondly, if any shall be offended at it with just cause, reason it self binds them to shew the same, and that shall be for my benefit also, because therby I may come to see mine own infirmity, while I have time to mend it, and to get greater strength, which is the greatest benefit of all, having a mind aswell to see and heare from others, as to speak my selfe, knowing that he can never be a good teacher that is not a good learner: Courteous Reader therefore whosoever thou art let me intreat thee to read over this Booke, with an impartiall eye try it, and search it narrowly. and if good come to thee by it let God have the glory of it, if any thing be evill, let me have thy loving admonition in that particular, and in so doing thou shalt perform me a good Office of love to the truth, and to me also, but as my whole intention is in it to set forth the truth so am I not privy of any thing impertinent to that purpose, and if thou upon search shalt finde it so, and shalt profit by it to thy saving instruction, and soules health, I shall have my desire and ever rest,

Thine in the Lord,

THOMAS LAMBE.

A CONFUTATION OF INFANTS BAPTISME,

FOraſmuch as by the providence of our good and gracious God, there hath come a writing unto my hands, which containeth ſome Arguments for the defence of *Infants Baptiſme*, written by one *George Phillips*, bearing the name of Paſtor, of the Church of *Watertowne* in *New England*, as the ſame writing doth expreſſe. I ſhall endeavour therefore briefly and plainely, as God ſhall enable me to make anſwer thereunto, and firſt this Author Matter *Phillips* before he comes to the Arguments, doth ſet downe certaine propoſitions to make way, as he ſaith, for the better underſtanding of his reaſons, and the firſt is this,

1. *That the Scriptures containing the old and new Teſtament, are full of ſatisfaction, and are a moſt perfect rule of all things concerning faith and Order: ſo that in theſe reſpects nothing is to be urged as neceſſarie, or allowed as lawfull but what is juſtly contained therein;*

Anſwer. This Propoſition is holy juſt and good, the ſecond followes.

Whatſoever can by juſt conſequence be drawne from any part of Scripture, expounded in their largeſt extent, is truly contained in them, aſwell as that which is ſet downe in expreſſe tearmes, and ſo it is of the ſame

force with that expressed in any case: so whatsoever can be collected by true deduction from a commandement is commanded, as well as that which is expressed, else how could all our duties to God and man be contained in the ten words, or how could any duty bind but that which is expressed? so our Saviour, Mat. 4. 10. urgeth the Divell with this word only, which is not in the text expressed in Deut. but yet truly drawne from thence.

Answer. I see no inconvenience in this proposition neither, ~~in~~ the third ~~which~~ followes.

That the tender of immortality and happines by God unto mankind, hath, beene dispensed two wayes, first unto Adam and all mankind in his loynes by the Law upon condition of perfect obedience thereto in mans owne personall righteousnesse: 2. After Adam was faine by an Evangelicall Covenant made with the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven and all the Elect predestinated unto adoption of Sonship, in him, as the common root of them all; which (meaning the Covenant though it be one and the same for ever in substance, from the time of the first promulgation untill this day, and so to the end, yet it hath admitted of variation in the circumstance thereof, as is cleare from foure severall and remarkable periods: the first from Adam faln to Abraham, under a promise of the seed of the Woman, Gen. 3. 15.

The second from Abrahams time to Moses in the wildernesse, in substance the same with the former, the seed of the woman, to proceed from Abrahams loynes in the flesh successively, but differing from the former, in passing the promise into a solemne Spirituall Covenant made with Abraham, as the Father of all the blessed, and all blessing seed, and of all believers of all Nations, and confirmed by the signe of Circumcision, the seale of the righteousnesse of faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

The third from Moses to the time of Christs comming in the flesh, and this is the same in substance with the former, but differing the manner of dispencing in drawing a vaile of shadows over it, consisting of all those Lawes written in stone, and all those Ordinances divulged from Mount Sinai, unto Abrahams posterity in the flesh, whereunto was added besides the former seale of circumcision, the Ordinance of the Passeover, and this (and not the former period) was called the Old Testament, or Law ratified by the death and blood of Bulls and Goates, &c. and shaddowes of better things without the application whereof, they purified only the flesh, and not the conscience.

The fourth begins, when the Sonne of God was manifested in the flesh

The

and ſtill continues, called the new Teſtament and ratified by the blood and death of the Lord Ieſus the Teſtator, who being come, the vaile of ſhaddowes is vterly removed, and the Moſaicall adminiſtration quite aboliſhed: the Old being done away that the New might bee eſtabliſhed that cannot bee removed, and this is well to be heeded, that all the Scriptures in the Old Teſtament, that foretell a removall, and diſannulling of the Covenant, and the Scriptures in the new that tell of the aboliſhing that was foretold, as alſo the making of a new Covenant is to bee underſtood of that perſod from Moſes *to Chriſt, and not of that of* Abraham *to* Moſes, *and the oppoſition that is made in the Scripture, is betweene that of* Moſes *and this under Chriſt.*

Anſw. To this propoſition I have many exceptions againſt the ſame, and though you profeſſe your ſelfe to be a Paſtor, yet you muſt give me leave to tell you, that ſuch Doctrine as this doth declare that ſuch a name doth not (or very ill) agree vnto you in that it is not wholſome food for Chriſts ſheep but a barren wilderneſſe or rather hurtfull, and effecting noyſome diſeaſes tending to death.

Firſt therefore if you limit the Reprobates from the tender of immortality and happines from God by means of the ſecond *Adam*, I conceive you erre, becauſe then how can they be ſaid to refuſe the call of *God*, *Prov.* 1. 24, and put away the word of God from them, thereby judging themſelves vnworthy of eve-laſting life, *Acts* 13.46? or make God a lyar, 1. *Iohn* 5. 11. or how ſhould vnbeliefe be a ſinne, *Iohn* 16. 9. ? but this by the way.

Secondly to your third period, I ſay the ordinances deliverd in *Moſes* time, was not a vayle ſimply conſidered but in reſpect that *Chriſt* which was contained in them was not underſtood by the Jewes, which reſted in the deed done.

Thirdly, to your third period, whereas you ſay, that this (and not that in the former period) was called the *Old Teſtament*, I know no reaſon why you ſhould ſo conclude eſpecially the rather ſeeing you make all your foure periods, to proceed from the Evangelicall Covenant, only varying in circumſtances, which if it be ſo, I conceive you will find no other difference between *Old Teſtament* and *New* properly; but the time before the comming of Chriſt in the fleſh and the time ſince: for *Abell*, *Noah* and *Iacob*, offered ſacrifice as well as the Iſraelites did. and

God did never appoint the ten Commandements, nor the Ordinances administred by the Leviticall Priesthood, to the end, that the performers should be saved without faith in Christ, and this you say that they were shadowes of better things, without the application whereof they purified only the flesh and not the conscience: and the sacrifices of *Abell*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, and *Iacob*, (and Circumcision as well as the Passeover) were shadowes of better things, without the application whereof, they purified only the flesh, and not the conscience of him that did the service: therefore both those two periods were as well the *Old Testament* as the other, by your owne Argument.

And therefore to your fourth period, which you say, begins when the Son of God was manifested in the flesh, and still continues, called the new *Testament*, and ratified by the death and bloud of the Lord Iesus the Testator, who being come, the vaile of shaddowes is utterly removed: I would aske whether circumcision, and the sacrifices that were administred before *Moses* time, be not quite abolished (the Old being done away that the New might be established (which cannot be removed) as well as those in *Moses* time; thirdly if yea: then this is well to be heeded, that all the Scriptures in the *Old Testament* that foretell a removall, and disanulling of the Covenant, and the Scriptures in the New, that tell of the abolishing that was foretold, as also of the making a new Covenant is to be understood, as well of the whole time before the comming of Christ, as of that betweene *Moses* and Christ, and thus is your proposition answerd and refuted.

Your fourth proposition is this, that children are capable of the Spirit of God, and of the grace of the Covenant, and whatsoever men of years are capable of, though not wrought in the same way and by the same meanes, yet the same things, and by the same spirit so farre as is necessary to union with Christ, and justification to life thereby.

Answ. This I grant, as they are Subjects for God to work upon, but this is not manifested to us, neither can it be concluded by us to belong to this child more than to that, or the children of beleevers, more than to the children of Infidells, or unbelievers, &c.

And where it is said, *nor is the Iudgement we can have of men of yeares*

yeares infallible, but that we may be miſtaken, as in the caſe of Symon Magus &c.

Anſw. I anſwer, it doth not follow from hence, that we ſhould have no Judgement of them, becauſe we cannot have an infallible Judgement; now if it be concluded that we ought to judge probably, according to the profeſſion of Faith made by them: I aske then how we ſhall come to the ſame manifeſtation from *Infants*: which when we can, let them be baptiſed, for if we ſhould doe it before, we do not only walke without rule, but alſo it may be ſaid to us in this caſe, as Chriſt ſaid to the woman of *Samaria* in another caſe, *Ioh.* 4. 22. *Ye worſhip that which ye know not*; and as God ſaid to the Jewes, *Iſa.* 1. 12. *Who required this at your hands?*

The fifth Propoſition followes,

That *Baptiſme is not the firſt grace but a ſecond, nor doth it confer grace, but is given to confirme the former, which therefore muſt be preſuppoſed, or elſe not to be adminiſtred; and it is the ſeale of the* New Teſtament, *or of the righteouſneſſe of Faith now to all, that are partakers thereof, as of old Circumciſion, was to them* Rom. 4. 11. *only by* baptiſme *I underſtand that outward part, adminiſtred by a lawfull Miniſter of the Church which may, and too often is ſeparated from the inward (though it ought not to be) and yet remaines true* baptiſme *ſo adminiſtred, elſe* Symon Magus, *and thoſe falſe brethren,* Gal. 2 *being not baptiſed with the inward were not baptiſed: and if they had repented muſt have beene baptiſed a new.*

Anſ. To this I anſwer, that *baptiſme* (being not the firſt grace but a ſecond, as your ſelfe confeſſe, nor doth it conferre grace, but is given to confirme the former, which therefore muſt be preſuppoſed or elſe not to be adminiſtred: as well to be heeded of all: but eſpecially of thoſe which will have *Infants* baptiſed: and yet have no ground to conclude, that they have a firſt grace to be confirmed by that meanes; neither have they ground for any ſuch preſuppoſition; neither will, *Rom.* 4. 11. prove any ſuch thing; for that only proves that circumciſion was in the nature of it, a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe which is by faith and did ſeale it up to *Abraham* that had faith: but as it did not ſeale it to them that had no faith: ſo no more was it any ground why we ſhould preſuppoſe faith formerly in all the ſubjects, upon

whom it was administred; neither was that the ground why it was administred, but the command of God, and the reason why God commanded it to *Abraham* touching his seed, was not because *Abraham* was bound to believe and presuppose, that all his Seed, and his Seeds Seed, throughout their Generations, were made partakers of Union with *Christ*, and Justification to life by the Spirit of God, (as is insinuated in the connexion of the fourth and fifth Propositions) but that God did by this meanes take and distinguish the posterity of *Abraham* to be possessed by his favour and goodwill of Lawes and Ordinances, Ministers, Services, Sacrifices, Tabernacle and Temple, and all other things which were meanes to typifie, lead and point out to them Christ which was to come: which was a choyce favour beyond any that was bestowed upon any other Nation or People: besides, *Deut.* 7. 6.7,8.9. *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. *Psal.* 147. 19, 20. and this was the end why the seed were required to be circumcised at eight dayes old, that they being distinguished by this meanes, and thereby interessed into the participation of these Priviledges, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. might be trained up therein; and whosoever else of any other Nation would circumcise themselves and their Males, might come and be partakers of these Priviledges with the posterity of *Abraham*, *Exod.* 12. 48. though there were no ground to presuppose a first grace to be confirmed in them by Circumcision.

Secondly, I answer (to the limitation of your conception to the outward part of Baptisme, which may and too oft is administred, separated from the inward, though it ought not to be) which yet remaines true Baptisme so administred or else *Simon Magus* and those false brethren, *Gal.* 2. being not baptised with the inward, were not baptised, and if they had repented, must have beene baptised anew;) that there is a great difference to be put betweene false brethren and no brethren, because those which are false seeme to be true but those that are no brethren, not so much as in shew, there is not so much as a shew for any brotherly action to be exercised upon them; and the reason why it remains true Baptisme upon the one which makes shew, and not upon the other which makes no shew, is because Gods authority in his command goes with the one and not with the other;

other; and this appeares, becauſe Baptiſme being an action of Religion to be exerciſed by the miniſtery of men, it is required that they adminiſter the ſame upon beleevers, which if they appeare, ſo they are to judge, and who can judge no otherwiſe but by appearance, it being Gods Prerogative to ſearch the heart; but when there is no externall manifeſtation appearing from the ſubject. then if Baptiſme be adminiſtred, it is meer humane invention becauſe there is no authority of God for ſuch an Adminiſtration: now, it is the Authority or command of God, which gives a being to every adminiſtration in Religion; and whatſoever hath not a being from God cannot be called his Ordinance; hereupon it followeth that whenſoever Baptiſme is adminiſtred upon ſuch a ſubject as maketh no externall manifeſtation of Faith, this Baptiſme hath no being from God, but is an humane device.

Your 6. Propoſition is this, that as of old more was required of Abraham *and men of yeares when they were circumciſed. then of* Iſhmael *or* Iſaac, *or other Infants continually circumciſed afterwards; ſo now in adminiſtring Baptiſme to perſons, more is required of men of yeares then of infants; as of* Abraham *God required Faith, in the bleſſed ſeed; but not the ſame of* Iſaac; *for of men of yeares Faith is to be required, and muſt be, that a man may be baptiſed; but not the ſame of Infants, &c.*

To which I anſwer, that more was in *Abraham* then in *Iſaac*, when they were circumciſed; I grant, but that more was required in the one then in the other, without which he might not be circumciſed, is eaſilier ſaid then proved, in the 17. of *Geneſis*, 10. and 13. verſe, it is ſaid, that *Abraham* muſt circumciſe all the males which were borne in his houſe, or bought with his money, and verſe 23. it is ſaid, that *Abraham* tooke *Iſhmael* his ſonne which was then 13. yeares old, verſe 25. and all the Males in his houſe, and circumciſed them the ſame day, as God had ſaid; ſome were men of yeares, as verſe 27. yet God did not require of *Abraham* concerning his males, nor did *Abraham* require of them in relation to any rule preceding any prerequiſite conditions, without which they were not to be circumciſed; the contrary is more probable by farre: namely, that they were to be circumciſed, is abſolutely commanded, and they were in no wiſe to neglect the ſame, and ſo to doe were ſinfull, but that

prere-

prerequisite conditions in them, without which they were not to be circumcised, is not so much as intimated to be appointed.

In *Exod.* 12. 48. it is said, if any will observe the Passeover, Circumcision of all his males is required to proceed as a generall Law to the home-borne and to the stranger, but to the participation of Circumcision of himselfe, and all his males also, nothing is required to precede. Now in the new Testament there is a Ministery ordained of God for the ministration of *Baptisme*; but in the time of the law there was no ministery appointed for Circumcision, but the head of every Family only stood charged with that worke to see the accomplishment thereof.

And hereof came another difference, that in Baptisme there is a lett spoken of, as *Act.* 8. 36. 10. 47. that if Faith did not appeare at least externally to the Minister, he might not administer Baptisme: but in Circumcision, any man might circumcise himselfe and his males, and thereby become a Proselyte, without any fore-going condition; because there was no order or state of men appointed by God to require any such thing of him before; and therefore in that respect, no lett spoken of in Scripture.

But the maine difference appeares in that God never appointed a teaching Ministery to precede Circumcision to the Parties required to be circumcised, as now he hath to all the Parties required to be baptised, even from that time to the end of the World *Mat.* 28. 18, 19. and hereupon ariseth another difference, even in the Constitution of the true visible Church, which then was constituted by naturall generation of *Abrahams* naturall seed, but now is constituted by spirituall regeneration of *Abrahams* spirituall seed, by the means of the preaching of the Gospel, even called Saints at least so far as men can judge. as all the Epistles of *Paul* to the *Churches* do plainly prove; and by all this is your insinuation of the Baptisme of Infants taken away.

Further, I cannot but take notice of a contradiction between this Proposition and your fifth Proposition, in which you say Faith or a first grace must be presupposed, or else Baptisme not to be administred: but here you say that of men of yeares faith is to be required, and must be, that a man may be baptised but not the same of Infants; how you will reconcile this contradiction,

diction, I doe not yet conceive; if you will ſay that grace may be, though not knowne in Infants, but in men of yeares, that are able to manifeſt what is in them; ſuch manifeſtation is to be required from them, without which they are not to be baptiſed: I ſay that this is no reconciliation of the contradiction; for as grace may be in Infants and not knowne, ſo it may not be, as it is not knowne to be; but you ſay Baptiſme is given to confirme the former grace, which therefore muſt be preſuppoſed, or elſe not be adminiſtred; and here you ſay, that of men of yeares Faith is to be required and muſt be, that a man may be baptiſed; but not the ſame of Infants: now whatſoever is to be preſuppoſed, muſt be, and muſt be required to be, or elſe baptiſme not to be adminiſtred, and yet the ſame not required to be in Infants, and yet Infants to be baptiſed, is an apparant contradiction, becauſe whatſoever is not to be required to be in Parties to be baptiſed, is not to be preſuppoſed to be, or elſe baptiſme not to be adminiſtred. And thus have I made Anſwer to your ſixth Propoſition; and now I come to your Arguments, the firſt whereof is this.

If the Covenant now under Chriſt be the ſame that was with Abraham *and his Poſterity in the Fleſh; then as Infants were then partakers of the Covenant, and received the Seale thereof, Circumciſion; ſo are Infants partakers of the Covenant, and ought to receive the Seale thereof, Baptiſme.*

But the Covenant now under Chriſt is the ſame that was before Chriſt, with Abraham *and his poſterity in the fleſh*; Ergo,

To which I anſwere, denying your Antecedent; namely, that the Covenant now under Chriſt is the ſame that was before Chriſt with *Abraham* and his poſterity in the Fleſh, and for the clearing up of my grounds of this Anſwer, I deſire to ſhew concerning this Covenant made with *Abraham* in *Gen.* 17. 7. firſt, what it was not; ſecondly, what it was; thirdly, that we have no ſuch Covenant now in the time ſince Chriſts comming in the fleſh concerning our ſeed.

Firſt therfore God did never promiſe to ſave any of *Abrahams* children for *Abrahams* ſake: ſecondly, nor yet for his faiths ſake; thirdly, nor to make all his Poſterity in the fleſh to be Believers. Firſt therefore *Abraham* was an heire of ſinne and death, as all

other men are, and was saved through the Mediator, *Joh.* 8. 56. *Heb.* 11. 13. *Rom.* 4. 1. 2. *Gal.* 3. 6. therefore *Abrahams* person did not move God to save his children who was saved by the undeserved grace and mercy of God through the Mediator himselfe.

Secondly, not for his faiths sake: first, because faith is not a meriting thing, it being that by which a man believes the favour of God in Christ; secondly, because if it were, then Christs Doctrine would prove false *Joh.* 3. 3. verily, verily saith Christ, *Except a man be borne again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God*; thirdly, if it were so, then God should save some, the salvation of whom would bring no glory to God at all: and the reason is, if any should be saved that have no faith in their owne hearts, only because their Parents have believed for them: then it will follow that some should be saved which neither know their own misery, nor Gods mercy, nor wisedome, nor power, nor justice, nor goodnesse; and so consequently know not how to be thankfull for any benefit, seeing they know none, which is contrary to the end for which he saveth men, which is the praise of his owne name: besides, this is further proved by these Texts of Scripture, *Hab.* 2. 4. The just shall live by his Faith, *Gal.* 6. 5. Every man shall beare his own burthen, *Ezek.* 18. 20. besides in *Isa.* 10. 22. *Rom.* 9. 22. it is said, though Israel be as the sand of the Sea; yet but a Remnant of them shall be saved; all which proveth that the Israelites were not saved for *Abrahams* faiths sake.

Thirdly, neither did God ever promise to give faith to all *Abrahams* Posterity in the flesh: First, because it is impossible that God should lie; but if he promised to give faith to them all, and did not, then he did lie; but that is false, therfore he never promised so to doe.

Secondly, God blames the unprofitablenesse of the Iewes, in respect of the meanes vouchsafed, which if in this respect he had bound himselfe to worke in them, what hee required of them were a contradiction; therefore he did not promise so to doe; and so much of the first particular, what it is not.

Secondly, I am now to shew what it is, and I say, God did command Circumcision upon *Abrahams* Posterity in the flesh, and did

did thereby take, conſecrate, ſeparate, ſet apart and diſtinguiſh them to be by his favour, and good will, and great love poſſeſſed with divers Lawes and Ordinances, Miniſters, Services, Sacrifices, Tabernacle and Temple, and all other things which they did poſſeſſe by the appointment of God afterwards, which were meanes to typifie and point out to them, and lead them unto Chriſt, which was to come, *Gal.* 3. 23,24, 25. and unto this people and Poſterity of *Abraham* did give a holy Land ſeparate from all other, for a place for them to dwell in, and did appoint a Citie in that Land ſeparate from all others to be worſhipped in *Ioh.* 4. 20. *Deut.* 12. 5. 6. 12, 13, 18, 26. and in that City did appoint a Temple for to offer ſacrifices in by the Miniſtery of the Prieſts, which they might not offer elſewhere, which was a Priviledge that no other Nation enjoyed, *Deu.* 7. 6 7 8, 9. *Ro* 9. 4, 5. *Pſal.* 147. 19, 20. and whoſoever would be circumciſed might come to Ieruſalem, and be poſſeſſed with the ſame Priviledges, both they and all that belonged unto them, both children and ſervants, *Exo.* 12. 48. 49. but the uncircumciſed Man-child in whoſe fleſh the fore-skin is not circumciſed, even that perſon ſhall be cut off from among his people, *Gen.* 17. 14. and thus I have declared the ſecond particular what it is. Now followeth the third that we ſince Chriſt have no ſuch Coevnant concerning our fleſhly ſeed, becauſe there is no Chriſt now to come to be manifeſted by ſuch meanes as was then, and the neceſſary abſence of the truth, or thing typified did neceſſarily require the type, and the neceſſary preſence of the truth or thing typified doth neceſſarily require the abſence of the type.

Now that the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* was a type of Chriſt the true promiſed ſeed, is manifeſt in *Gal.* 3. *ver.* 16. compared with 19. where *Paul* ſaith to *Abraham* and his ſeed were the Promiſes made; he ſaith not and to thy ſeeds, as of many, but and unto thy ſeed, as of one, which is Chriſt; and verſ. 19. he ſaith, the Law was added till the ſeed came, unto which the promiſes were made, (which was Chriſt) here *Paul* by the power of the Spirit doth interpret the promiſe of God to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. (where God ſaith, I will eſtabliſh my Covenant betweene me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their Generations for an everlaſting Covenant to be God unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee) in re-

ſpect of the ſeed to be meant in the ſingular number (namely of one) which is Chriſt: now if any ſhall ſay this lets not but all the faithfull may be underſtood, which make up one myſticall body being one with him by faith. He the head, and they the members; I ſhall freely grant it to be ſo according to 1 *Cor.* 12. 12.

But now it remaines how we may conceive the naturall ſeed to be interpreted to be Chriſt, who did not believe ſurely, no way but ceremonially and typically, even as the male which was to be circumciſed did; and the Lambe to be eaten at the Paſſeover was to be a Male, and all the firſt borne males both man and beaſt were called holy, to be offered to the Lord in typicall relation to Chriſt the true propitiatory Sacrifice.

So then when Chriſt the true promiſed ſeed was come, the ſeed in the fleſh that led to Chriſt, ceaſed.

And ſo it did indeed, for the naturall relation ceaſed at the death of Chriſt, and not before, at which time the diſtinction or different holineſſe betweene Iew and Gentile ceaſed, *Acts* 10. 28. *Eph.* 2. 14, 15. in *Rom* 11. 20. it is ſaid, through unbeliefe they are broken off; now, it is manifeſt they were the true Church till the death of Chriſt, and then broken off through unbeliefe: why were not the Jewes in the ſin of unbeliefe before? Yes, no doubt; why? then were they not broken off before, and why then? The reaſon is becauſe the time of faith was come, and therefore now they were broken off through unbeliefe; the Seed was come, therefore the naturall Seed ceaſed; Chriſt was come, therefore the Law ceaſed; as long as the Law laſted they did remaine in the Church by being circumciſed, and obſerving the Rites and Ceremonies of the Law, though they did remaine in unbeliefe; but when the time of faith was come, *Gal.* 3. 25. Then they were no longer in the Covenant and Church, by obſerving the Rites and Ceremonies of the Law, which they entred into by Circumciſion; but now they were broken off through unbeliefe, which notes out unto us that the ſtanding in that Church before Chriſt in the time of the law, and the ſtanding in this Church ſince Chriſt in the time of the Goſpell, is upon different grounds, for the ſtanding in that Church was by being circumciſed, and obſerving the Rites and Ceremonies of the Law: but the ſtanding in this Church is by faith, and

being

being baptiſed into the ſame faith, *Act.* 2. 38, 41. Ioh. 4. 1. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. *Rom.* 11. 20. and it is to be noted that the Iewes, the ſame people that were circumciſed, and in Covenant with *Abraham* according to the fleſh, and thereby members of the Iewiſh Church, could not be the viſible Church according to the Goſpell, unleſſe they did manifeſt faith, and ſo bee in Covenant with *Abraham* according to the Spirit, and baptiſed into the ſame faith: whereas if the Covenant now under Chriſt were the ſame that was before Chriſt with *Abraham* and his poſterity in the fleſh, then by the ſame right they poſſeſſed Circumciſion, and the Iewiſh Church-ſtate, they muſt poſſeſſe this ſince Chriſt, which they could not doe, therefore it is not the ſame.

It is true therefore that the Covenant of God, makes the Church both in the time of the Law and Goſpell too, for the Church is nothing elſe then a people in Covenant with God; now looke how the Covenant differs, ſo the Church and people differs, which is made by it, and which enter into it.

Now the Covenant whereby God tooke a people outwardly to be his people, then was that whereby they did (being circumciſed) participate of all thoſe outward meanes which led to Chriſt which was to come, *Pſal* 147. 19, 20.

But that Covenant whereby he takes a peopl outwardly to be his people now, whereby they are admitted to be baptiſed, is that profeſſion they make of faith in Chriſt, *Act.* 8. 12, 37. *Mat.* 3. 6. whereby th y have true and ſpirituall conjunction with God, and are his people. *Heb.* 3. 6.

Indeed it is true, that Chriſt is and ever was the Mediator and means of Salvation, and alſo that all thoſe that were ſaved, were ſaved through faith in him both before and ſince Chriſts comming; but yet becauſe the outward meanes of making Chriſt known doth differently depend upon his being yet to come, and upon his being come in the fleſh; the one being more darke, the other more plaine; the one more carnall, the other more ſpirituall; therefore the participation of theſe meanes doe make the ſtate of the participants to differ.

Concerning which, note theſe differences, firſt it's called the Old Teſtament, and the time ſince Chriſt, the New Teſtament, *Heb.* 9. 18. Secondly, it is called the carnall Commandement:

this since Christ is called the power of the endlesse life *Heb.* 7. 16. Thirdly, it is called a blameable Testament in opposition to a better Testament, established upon better promises, *Heb.* 8. 6 Fourthly it is called impotent, and *beggerly rudiments* in respect of Christ, which is the end of them, *Gal.* 4 9. *Col.* 2 8.

Fifthly, it's called a yoke of bondage, in opposition to the liberty and freedome which comes by the Gospell, *Gal.* 5. 1. *Act.* 15. 10. Sixtly it's called *Ierusalem* below, or earthly in opposition to *Ierusalem* above Celestiall, and Heavenly, which is the priviledge of the visible Church in the New Testament, *Gal.* 4. 25, 26. *Heb* 12. 22. Seventhly it's called a Law, and a Schoolmaster: the rudiments of the world: the time since Christ, the time of faith, *Gal*, 3. 19. 23, 24 and 4. 3, 4. Eightly, it's called the stop of the partition wall, the Law of Commandements standing in Ordinances: yea hatred, or the cause of hatered in opposition to the unity, and peace that comes by the Gospell, *Ephes.* 2. 14, 15. *Col.* 2. 14. and hereupon it followeth, that only such persons are to be admitted unto these Gospell-priviledges as are suitable thereunto.

This State then being		such only as are		are suitable thereunto.
1.	The New Testament.		1. In the new Covenant.	
2.	Established upon better promises,		2. In possession of the promises.	
3.	After the power of the endles life.		3. Partakers of the Powers of	
4.	In Christ.		4. In Christ (endles life.	
5.	In liberty of the Spirit,		5. In Freedome of the spirit,	
6.	Celestiall Jerusalem,		6. Borne from above.	
7.	A State of Faith.		7. In the Faith.	
8.	A State of Vnity and Peace.		8. In Vnity, Peace and love.	

Therefore only such are to be admitted unto the Gospell-priviledges. In the time therefore before Christ, such as would circumcise themselves, and their males and observe the Law in the Rights and Ceremonies thereof, together with their children by generation were the seed, and in Covenant with that Church.

But now since Christ, only such as believe in Christ and are thereby children by regeneration are the seed, and in covenant with this Church. The proofe of this is cleere, first, because none of the naturall seed of *Abraham*, are in the covenant by vertue of any naturall relation, though they did remaine in the Jewish Church till the death of Christ: and as that Church then

then ceased, so their being in the Church by a naturall relation ceased also, *Act.* 10 28. *Rom.* 9. 8. *Gal.* 4. 28. 31. 6. 3. 7. 9. 14. 16. 19. 22. 26. 28, 29. Secondly the *Gentiles* have no naturall relation to become *Abrahams* seed by: and therefore a believers child cannot become the seed of *Abraham* by being the seed of a believer, unlesse such children doe believe themselves, and cannot otherwise in no respect be participants in the covenant made with *Abraham.* Thirdly, neither did the three thousand converts baptise their children, when they themselves were baptised, as *Abraham* did according to Gods command, *Gen.* 17. 23. circumcise his Males the selfe same day; which plainly proves, that the Covenant now under Christ is not the same that was with *Abraham* and his posterity in the flesh: now that the 3000. converts did not baptise their children, when they were baptised themselvees is plaine, *Act.* 2. 41. the words are, *then they that gladly received the word were baptised,* 1, The meaning is onely they, and none other, or else it were an imperfect relation, if others that did not gladly receive the word were baptised also: therefore none but those, and therefore not their Infants; for such a testimony (*viz.* that they gladly received the word) is no where recorded in Scripture, neither can be of Infants; also *Acts* 8. 12. It is said, when they believed the things that concerned the kingdome of God, and the name of Jesus, they were baptised both men and women, and not before, therefore not their Infants. Fourthly *Paul* and others writing to the visible Churches, since Christ doe usually expresse themselves of all the members, as of Saints, faithfull brethren, called, reborne, the Sons of God by adoption, *Rom.* 1. 6. 8. *Chap.* 8. 15. 1 *Cor.* 1, 2. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. *Chap.* 4. 15, 16. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. 7 *Chap.* 3. 2. *Gal.* 3. 26. *Ephes.* 1. 3. 15. *Phil.* 1. 1. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. *Colo.* 1. 2, 3, 4. 1 *Thes.* 1. 1. 2. 4. 2 *Thes.* 1. 1. 3. 1 *Pet* 1. 1. 2 3. 10. 21, 22, 23. which the Prophets (notwithstanding they were led by the same spirit) were wont to speake otherwise of the visible Church of the Jewes, as *Isay* 1. 1. 16 *Ier. chap.* 1 and 2. *Ezek.* 3, 4 12. chap. 16. 48 51. which difference could not be if the naturall children had been in the Covenant, and of the Church as the Jewes were.

Fiftly, the Argument and purpose of *Paul* is to exclude all things, besides faith to be any wayes availeable to the participa-

tion

tion of the Covenant, in relation to *Abraham* in the time since Christ, *Rom.* 4. 16. *Gal.* 3. 7. 9. 14. 16. 19. 22. 26. 28. 29. therefore the posterity in the flesh are not now in the Covenant by any naturall relation, as they were before Christs comming in the flesh.

Sixtly, the Author to the *Heb.* 8. 8. saith from *Ier.* 31. 31. Behold I make a new Covenant with the house of *Judah*, not like the Covenant I made with their Fathers but this is the Covenant I will put my Law in their mind, and all shall know mee from the least of them to the greatest of them, where we are to note, that the principall difference is in the subjects of the covenants: in the former, God did not put his Law in their mind nor write it their hearts, that is so as without which they might not be of the house of *Israell*, but did write it in Tables of stone, requiring them to keepe it; but now is Christ the mediatour of the New Covenant, and Testament, that through death which was for the redemption of the transgressions, that were in the former Testament: they which were called might receive the promise of eternall inheritance, which promise being received, the persons so believing, and only they are the house of *Judah*, the true Israel of God, *Gal* 6. 16. *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. the subjects of this covenant, which have the Law written in their hearts: in the former Covenant many of the subjects of it were destitute of the knowledge of God, being the Posterity of *Abraham* according to the flesh: at the first Infants circumcised at 8. dayes old, according to the Law, and therefore were to learne God in Christ, when they came of yeares.

But now the Subjects of this covenant are such, as all of them do know God, from the least to the greatest, having the Law written in their hearts being all possessed of the benefit of remission of sinnes, through Faith by spirituall regeneration, vers. 12. chap 10 17. 18 Insomuch, as it is a great shame for the Church of *Corinth*, that any should bee amongst them destitute of the knowledge of God, 1 *Cor* 15. 34 (which could not be if Infants were the Subjects of this covenant and Church:) therefore the covenant since Christ is not the same that was before Christ, with *Abraham* and his posterity in the flesh, and this shall suffice for answer to this your Argument.

Now

Now I ſhall examine your proofes, and the firſt thing you would proue is, that the covenant made with Abram *and his poſterity in the fleſh, before Chriſt, and that now under Chriſt is the ſame: your firſt proofe is that the Goſpell is the Doctrine of the Covenant:*

But this was preached to Abraham, *and to the Iewes in the wilderneſs, and in* Davids *time, therefore the covenant is the ſame in all.*

Anſw. And is this a good proſe, to prove the covenant made with *Abrams* poſterity in the fleſh, before Chriſt, and ſince to be the ſame, ſurely no ſuch matter, and if it be, then to whomſoever the Goſpell which is the Doctrine of the covenant is preached, they with their poſterity are in the covenant, yea though they be the ſcoffing *Athens*, *Act.* 17, 18, 19, 20. for there is no more in your proſe, but let us ſee your ſecond proofe, you ſay.

If Abraham *be the father of the Iewes and Gentiles, and equally as he beleeves the righteouſnes of faith, & his children equally, as ſo beleiving and no otherwiſe, then the Covenant is the ſame.*

But Abraham *is the Father of the Iewes and Gentiles, and equally as he beleeves,* Rom. 4. 11, 12. 16, 17. 23, 24. Gal 3. 7. 9 26. 29. *therefore the Covenant is the ſame.*

Anſw. What conſequence hath this Argument, to prove that the covenant made with *Abram* and his poſterity in the fleſh before Chriſt, and that now under Chriſt is the ſame, ſurely none at all.

For firſt if none be *Abrahams* children, no otherwiſe than as they beleive the righteouſneſſe of faith, then when any doe ſo beleive, let them be baptiſed.

But it is true as it is ſaid and proved in the Scriptures, alleadged that none are *Abraham* children, neither of Jewes, nor Gentells, but as they doe beleive the righteouſneſſe of faith, *viz.* according to the promiſe) *Rom.* 9 8 *Gal.* 3. 29. *chap* 24. 28.

Therefore none other are Evangellically in the covenant, nor ought to be baptiſed.

Secondly, the body of the Jewiſh Nation were the poſterity of *Abraham*, according to the fleſh, were commanded to be circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. 10. and ſo in covenant according to the Law, or otherwiſe they could not have bin of the *Jewiſh* Church while the Law laſted, *Rom.* 9. 4. & they could not have been broken off

through unbeliefe, *Rom.* 11.20. and then in the time of the Law they might not eat the Paſſeover, *Exod.* 12. 48. neither might they come to the Temple to bring their Sacrifices, *Acts* 21. 2. therefore they were legally in the Covenant, though they were but the poſterity of *Abraham* according to the fleſh, yet none of the uncircumciſion might in the time before Chriſt partake of theſe Priviledges, nay, though they did believe, therefore the difference was very great.

Thirdly, now ſince Chriſt no *Gentile* is *Abrahams* ſeed at all, but by believing the righteouſneſſe of faith, although he be the Child of believing Parents. *Gal.* 3. 29.

Fourthly, none of the Jewes themſelves (which were the naturall ſeed of *Abraham* and partakers of all the Ordinances of the Old Teſtament, as well Circumciſion as any other, and that by vertue of the ſame naturall relation) could be admitted to be baptiſed, *Acts* 2. 39. nor yet to partake of any of the ſucceeding Ordinances of the Goſpell, but upon the manifeſtation of faith; therfore the Covenant before, and that ſince is not the ſame.

Your third Reaſon is of as little force as the former if it be well weighed; which is this, *That the ſtanding of the Jewes in the grace of God, was the ſame with* Abrahams.

I anſwere, here we muſt diſtinguiſh of the word *grace*, which may equally be taken either particularly for the Covenant of everlaſting life, by which the Saints are freely juſtified, as *Rom.* 3. 24. or elſe more generally for any effect of Gods goodneſſe whereby he doth freely communicate any kind of benefit unto men which muſt needs be by grace and favour, ſeeing no man deſerveth any thing at his hands.

This being premiſed, I now make anſwer, That if you take grace in the firſt ſence for the Covenant of everlaſting life by which the Saints are freely juſtified: then I deny that the Jewes were ever required to manifeſt their intereſt therein before they could be admitted to ſtand members of the viſible Church-ſtate before Chriſts comming; as all both Jewes and Gentiles muſt now ſince the death of Chriſt, *Acts* 8. 37. and yet nevertheleſſe all that were ſaved, it was by grace in this firſt ſence; but if grace be taken in the ſecond ſence (namely more generally) then I muſt needs acknowledge that it was Gods great grace and mercie

cie that the Jewes had a Law of Circumciſion and other ordinances which was to them as a Schoole-maſter to lead them to *Chriſt* which was to come, *Gal.*3.24. and alſo promiſes that *Chriſt* muſt be borne of their ſeed according to the fleſh *Ro.*9.5. (and in theſe reſpects, the ſtanding of the Jewes was the ſame with *Abrahams* (and theſe are the reſpects) ſpoken of by *Mary*, *Luke* 1. 54. 55. of the mercy ſpoken to *Abraham* and his ſeed, and the Covenant and Oath ſpoken of by *Zachary*, *ver.* 72. 73. namely, that Chriſt ſhould come, and was expected by them to be borne of the Virgin *Mary* and *Iohn* the *Baptiſt* to be his fore-runner, as appeareth *v.*47 compared with *v.*76. according to the promiſes and Oath of God made to *Abraham*, *Gen.*12.3. *chap.*22.16,17,18.

But all this is too ſhort to prove that the Covenant now under Chriſt, is the ſame that was before Chriſt, with *Abraham* and his poſterity in the fleſh; and therefore here you may ſee all your proofes for your aſſumption taken away, wherupon I ſuppoſe your double conſequence will faile alſo; but yet becauſe your conſequences ſtand diſtinct, and your proofes annexed to them, I will therefore conſider of them in order as they ſtand.

The firſt Conſequent that you would prove, is, *That Infants are now in the Covenant, as they were then before* Chriſt, *you are reſolved upon foure reaſons.*

The firſt is, elſe the Covenant were not the ſame with that which (as you ſay) you have proved it to be.

To which I anſwer, that I have diſproved your proofes of that particular, and therefore this reaſon is nothing.

2. You ſay *Elſe the ſtate of the grace of God ſhould be ſtraitned, and be made of leſſe extent by* Chriſts *comming, then it was before, whereas it is more enlarged and of greater extent; there being nothing more then in the ſtate of the perſon to intereſſe Infants in the Covenant then now.*

Firſt, I anſwere denying the conſequence, and the reaſon is becauſe the preaching of the Goſpell is as full as large and as ample a teſtimony of Gods grace, as any of the fleſhly poſterity of *Abraham* had by the Covenant, and larger; inaſmuch as the Goſpell preached now is a more full declaration of the grace of God and the benefits that come by Chriſt then ever Circumciſion or the Ordinances of the Old Teſtament did declare to them, and the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* had but the declaration

of the grace of God in Christ by the Covenant, then though the believing seed of *Abram* had the grace of God in Christ declared them.

And now the Seed of the Gentiles believers and unbelievers are made partakers of the preaching of the Gospell though they be not in the Covenant; which is a larger declaration of the grace of God and of the benefits that come by Christ, then ever the fleshly seed of *Abraham* had by being in the Covenant.

Therfore the exclusion of the fleshly seed doth not streighten the grace of God at all.

Secondly, as it was of larger extent in respect of the cleare Revelation of the grace of God beyond what it was before Christs comming; so likewise it is of larger extent in respect of the revelation to more people, then it did then, for then it was confined to the Land of Israel, and the people of the Jewes; but now this more cleare Revelation of the grace of God (abounding beyond whatever Circumcision and all the Ordinances of the Law did or could reveale unto the fleshly seed then in Covenant) is by Christ commanded to be preached to all Nations; yea, to every man and woman *Mark* 16. 15. *Mat.* 28. 18 19. *Lu.* 24 47. and yet the people nevertheleſſe more in Covenant nor to bee baptised unleſſe they believe, therfore the increase of the extent of Gods grace doth not necessarily imply a bringing of the fleshly seed of believers within the Covenant.

Thirdly, if you by extention of grace doe conceive that ever God did accept of the posterity of *Abraham* into the Covenant of everlasting life, by Christ, without faith in their owne persons, onely in relation to *Abraham*, and therupon conclude that the seed of believers are now much more taken into the covenant of everlasting life by the faith of their Parents: therein you erre, and such an extension of grace I doe absolutely deny both now and in the time before Christ too: this error was condemned in the Jewes by *Iohn Baptist*, *Mat.* 3. 9 and by Christ, *John* 8. 34 39 40. 41. But of this I have spoken sufficiently before.

Fourthly, and where it is said *That there was nothing more in the state of the persons, then to interest Infants in the covenant then now.*

I answer, That though there was nothing in the state of the Per-

Perſons; yet there was ſomething in things, and in the order of times, Chriſt being yet to come.

In which reſpect the neceſſary abſence of the truth, and true promiſed ſeed did neceſſarily require the type, namely the fleſhly ſeed to be ſelected, ſeparated and ceremonially holy, of whom the promiſed ſeed was to come: but now the neceſſary preſence of the truth, and true promiſed ſeed Jeſus Chriſt being come, doth neceſſarily require the abſence of the type, and the conſummation, termination, abrogation and utter abolution of this ſelected, ſeparated and ceremoniall holines of this naturall and fleſhly ſeed; and therefore now there is nothing but Evangelicall holines, ſelection or ſeparation remaining, which is not without perſonall faith, and therfore no viſible, being but upon externall manifeſtation, and conſequently no admittance to any Ordinance of the Covenant by any exerciſing lawfull authority in ſuch cauſes but only by vertue of ſuch externall manifeſta- and thus have I anſwered your ſecond Reaſon.

Your third Reaſon, whereby you would prove that infants are now in the Covenant as they were, then is this, *Abraham, being the root, and the Iewes and Gentiles the branches, as when the Iewes were broken off, and as well Infants as men of yeares; and ſo when Iewes be againe implanted, as well Infants as men of yeares ſhall be ſo.*

To which I anſwer, firſt I conceive (under favour) that by the root is meant Chriſt, according to that of *Iohn* 15. 5. where Chriſt ſaith, I am the Vine, ye are the branches, becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 11. 20 thou ſtandeſt by faith: now Chriſt is he proper object of faith, and not *Abraham.*

But admit that *Abraham* be the root; yet the Gentiles are not the branches in a naturall relation nor the Jewes branches in a ſpirituall relation, without perſonall faith, or elſe the Jewes could not be broken off through unbeliefe, becauſe unbeliefe doth not make the Jewes ceaſe to have naturall relation to *Abraham*; and therefore if you make Jewes and Gentiles to be the branches equall in relation to the root *Abram*, you muſt make the relation ſuch as is poſſible to them both ſuch onely is a ſpi-

rituall relation, *Galat.* 3. 29. for in a naturall relation it is not possible for the Gentiles to be branches in relation to the root *Abraham.*

3. Whereas you say, *when the Iewes were broken off, it was as well Infants as men of yeares.*

I answer, it is true, because Christ which was the true promised seed being come, the naturall relation in the Covenant ceased and now there was no relation in the Covenant with *Abraham*, but by faith in Christ onely.

4. Whereas you say, *That when the Iewes be againe implanted, as well Infants as men of yeares shall be so.*

I answer that as unbeliefe did breake them off, so faith onely must graft them in, as *ver.* 23.

But that ever the Jewes shall be planted so as Infants to be members of the visible Church without the manifestation of faith lawfully, as once they were before Christs comming, can be no way proved but it is an absolute error.

Fourthly, your fourth reason to prove Infants in the Covenant, as they were then, is this, *If the Iewes and Gentiles are incorporated into one Body in Christ, and the Iewish Infants are of that Body, then so must the Infants of the Gentiles be; but the Iewes and Gentiles are incorporated into one Body in Christ; (by the gentiles being made neere and Citizens, which they were not before the Iewes being in Christ)* Eph. 2.11. 20, & 3. 6. *and the Iewes Infants are of the same Body: therfore so are the Infants of the Gentiles.*

I answere, that this is recorded to belong to the Gentiles, as a benefit in speciall to be the Body of Christ: because the Jewes had meanes before, and some of the Jewes had faith by that means, and were true members of his Body: Christ the head and they the members, and so consequently the body; why because the members and the head make up the body, and then their were no members knowne, but the Jewes therefore no body; but the Jewes and the Gentiles had no meanes before, and therfore Christ by his comming brought this to passe, that meanes should be afforded as well and as much as to the Jewes, and consequently faith by the meanes and so united to Christ the head; now being joyned to the head, they must necessarily be joyned to the Body, therefore joyned to those believing Jewes which before

before were the body, but as the Jewes were no otherwiſe the body, but in relation to the head unto which they were united onely by faith: ſo the Gentiles had union with the Jewes no otherwiſe but through Chriſt the head of them both, being joyned to him by faith, and ſo to them.

Secondly, I ſay, that the Gentiles did not by converſion enter into fellowſhip with the Jewiſh nationall Church-ſtate; for that ſtate the Jewes poſſeſſed not by Chriſt themſelves, (but a new Goſpell-ſtate which onely ſome few of the Nation, which were converted to the faith participated of) therfore much leſſe could the Gentiles participate of any ſuch Church ſtate with them now: then, if neither Jewes nor Gentiles were the body of Chriſt conſiderably as a Nation; but only in reſpect of converſion by which they were inheritors of the ſame body, and partakers of the ſame promiſe in Chriſt by the Goſpell; then were not the Jewes meerly as Jewes of the body, and ſo conſequently not their Infants.

But neither Jewes nor Gentiles were the body of Chriſt conſiderably as a Nation, but onely in reſpect of converſion by the Goſpell, *Eph.* 3. 6. Therefore the Jewes meerly as Jewes are not of the body of Chriſt, and conſequently not their Infants till they be converted; and therefore ſo are not the Infants of the Gentiles neither; and thus you may ſee your reaſons of proving Infants in the Covenant to faile you, and therefore your next conſequence will ſurely fall, which is this, that Infants ought now to be baptiſed, as then circumciſed.

Firſt, *Elſe the Covenant were not the ſame, nor Infants in it.*

I anſwere no more, it is not the ſame in reſpect of the naturall relation to *Abraham*, as I have ſhewed and therefore Infants not in it

Secondly, you ſay if they have the thing and ſubſtance, they cannot be denied the ſeale and circumſtance, if the firſt grace, then the ſecond confirming.

I anſwer true, when they manifeſt that they have the thing and ſubſtance, or any other can manifeſt it for them, then let them have the ſeale and circumſtance; and ſurely none can forbid water, why they ſhould not be baptiſed, when they are knowne to be in the Covenant.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, you say, *If by vertue of this word of God to* Abraham *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, Infants are included, and therefore of old circumcised, and the same promises be continued in the same state to the Gentiles; then the Gentiles Infants are also in it, but the first is true* Ergo,

I answer, that the same promises are not continued in the same state to the Gentiles who are not *Abrahams* children by naturall relation nor yet is it continued to the Jewes, neither seeing their being in the Covenant by a naturall relation ceased at the death of Christ, at which time the commandement of Circumcision ceased also and had the naturall relation held the naturall seed within the Covenant still; then doubtlesse the commandement had remained still touching the circumcising of that naturall seed, for there is no more reason for the ceasing of theone, then for the ceasing of the other; and if Circumcision had remained, then I suppose none would have pleaded for the baptising of Infants; but if the Covenant be ceased touching the naturall seed, then there is no Infants to be circumcised, nor baptised neither; but the Covenant ceased at the death of Christ touching the naturall seed, *Act.* 10. 28. *Gal.* 3 25. *Eph.* 2. 14. 15, *Rom* 11. 20. 21. *Gal.* 4. 25, 26. therfore this is no proofe for Infants to be circumcised nor baptised neither.

And thus I have done with your first Argument; your second followes thus.

If in the whole body of Israelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptised, and with the same baptisme that ours is, then Infants are now to be baptised, as then they were: but in the whole body of Israelites Infants were baptised, and that with the same Baptisme spiritually that ours is.

Therefore Infants are now to be baptised as then they were.

I answer, this Argument is a sophisme and lies not true in his forme; for in the first part of your Argument it appeares as if you intended that the Israelites were baptised corporally as now since Christ the Disciples of Christ were: and in the second part of your Argument you tell us it is the same Baptisme spiritually that ours is, whereas if you had said so in the first part then I say your Antecedent would be too narrow to inferre the consequent; and this I shall manifest by laying downe your Argument

ment in ſuch a forme as it may agree with it ſelfe; (for as it lies now it agrees not with it ſelfe.)

Firſt, if in the whole Body of Iſraelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptiſed, and with the ſame Baptiſme materially and formally, that ours is; then Infants are now to be baptiſed as then they were.

But in the whole Body of Iſraelites Infants were baptiſed, and that with the ſame Baptiſme materially and formally that ours is. Therfore Infants are now to be baptiſed as then they were.

Who would not ſee firſt that your *Minor* were falſe, the cloud and the Sea not being the ſame Baptiſme materially and formally that ours is: and ſecondly neither would the conſequence follow, becauſe Infants were then baptiſed; therefore Infants muſt now be baptiſed, no more then becauſe *Adam* was not to eat of the Tree in the midſt of the Garden; therfore the eating of ſome kind of fruit by us is evill; or no more then this, Infants were circumciſed then, therefore Infants muſt be circumciſed now.

But ſecondly, I will ſupply your Argument in the firſt part with that which is expreſſed in the ſecoud pat, and then ſee the force and power of it thus: if in the whole body of Iſraelites as well Infants as men of yeares were baptiſed, and with the ſame Baptiſme ſpiritually that ours is; then Infants are now to bee baptiſed as then they were.

But in the whole Body of the Iſraelites Infants were baptiſed, and with the ſame Baptiſme ſpiritually, that ours is.

And now I deny the conſequence, and will ſhew you how the Antecedent is too narrow to inferre the ſame thus.

That although God did by the miraculous working of his divine providence, grace and goodneſſe lead the People of Iſrael through the ſea dry, and drowned the Ægyptians which were their enemies, and did alſo affoord them a cloudy Pillar, which was a defence from their enemies, and a guid to them in their way whither they were going, which muſt be in the nature of the things conſidered as great a Sacrament, ſigne or token of Gods love in Chriſt to that people, as Baptiſme was to the Corinthians, and therefore called Baptiſme: and (for no other reaſon will it from hence follow, that we ſhould adminiſter ſuch

an Ordinance as Baptiſme is to our Infants without a command from God ſo to do for this is the force of your Argument; God did by the worke of his providence baptiſe the Infants of Iſrael ſpiritually, *Ergo* we may by our worke without Gods command baptiſe our Infants materially, ceremonially and formally; and is this good reaſoning? who ſees not that God hath no limits, but may by his providence teſtifie his grace as largely as he wil; therfore we may deviſe means to worſhip God as large as we wil, or may adminiſter his means to whom we will, without any direction from him: who ſees not that there is no force in ſuch manner of arguing; but it is abſurd and erronious ſo to reaſon?

Thirdly, therefore the purpoſe of *Paul* is, to declare to the Corinthians that Ordinances would doe them no more good without faith and repentance, then Miracles (which were as great as Ordinances) could doe the Iſraelites good to prevent Judgements when they ſinned; and that therefore it would be a vaine thing for theſe Corinths to reſt ſecure in the poſſeſſion of theſe Ordinances, as if God reſpected them thereby without Faith in Chriſt, ſuch a faith as preſerved them from thoſe ſins which the Iſraelites committed; the which faith if they had not, they were no more exempt from Gods diſpleaſure, plagues and Judgments then the Iſraelits were: and if Ordinances would ſecure theſe Corinths, then thoſe miracles would ſecure them: but theſe Miracles did not ſecure them; therefore theſe Ordinances cannot ſecure you; but you muſt have a better ſecurity then this, namely, faith in the blood of Chriſt, whereby you are to be carried on towards God in all things as a People profeſſing and practiſing the truth: But his purpoſe is not to ſhew that Ordinances, namely Baptiſme and the Lords Supper are required to be adminiſtred by theſe Corinths to themſelves and to their Infants, though they do not believe in Chriſt: becauſe then God did exercite ſuch Miracles to the Iſraelites which did not believe, which is the ſequell of this Argument compared with the proofe, as we ſhall ſee by the examination thereof; for your firſt proofe is this.

You ſay, *That the other Ordmances there mentioned, are the ſame ſpiritually with ours; they eat the ſame ſpirituall meat, and drank the ſpirituall drink with us.*

I anſwer then by conſequence belike the Corinths muſt baptiſe themſelves and their Infants, and both of them eat the Lords Supper, though neither of them doe believe, becauſe then God led the Iſraelites through the Sea drie, and gave them the Cloud, and Manna, and the Rock which ſpiritually is the ſame with ours, which notwithſtanding did not believe: the which thing thus laid open, I hope you will not affirme.

Secondly, I anſwer therefore that you erre in calling them (the other Ordinances there mentioned) whereas they are the ther Miracles, which had you well weighed, you would not have made them the ground of your Argument for the juſtifying of ſuch a practice as the baptiſing of Infants is.

Fourthly, beſides if after the Iſraelites were entred into the Land of Canaan, they were then neither baptiſed with the cloud nor ſea, nor any other baptiſme; then was not the baptiſme which they had before in the cloud and in the ſea an example of perpetuall practice of Baptiſme: but the firſt is true, for they entred through the Sea but once, and the cloud ceaſed when they entred into Canaan, neither can any ſhew that they were baptiſed with any other Baptiſme; therefore the Baptiſme which they had before, is not an example of perpetuall practice of Baptiſme.

Fifthly Baptiſmes of different kinds depends upon different grounds, and are to be adminiſtred upon different Subjects for different ends but the Baptiſme of the Cloud and Sea, and the Baptiſme we have now are of divers kindes, *ergo* they depend upon different grounds, and are to be adminiſtred upon different ſubjects for different ends.

Your ſecond proofe you ſay, *Otherwiſe the Apoſtles Argument were not of force againſt the Corinthians if they were not the ſame Sacraments with ours, nor the concluſion containe that the Corinthians ſhould be puniſhed with the like puniſhment, if they committed the like ſinne.*

I anſwer, denying the conſequence, for although the Cloud and Sea, Manna and the Rock, were Sacraments of the ſame Chriſt that Baptiſme and the Lords Supper is, yet they were not the ſame Sacraments; and it ſufficeth to the Apoſtles purpoſe that the Cloud, Sea, Manna, and Rock, were as great and effectuall tokens of Chriſt, and ſo they were in the nature of the things ſimply conſidered) as Baptiſme and the Lords Supper

is, though they were different Sacraments of the ſame Chriſt and not the ſame Sacraments, and except they were dipt in water, and did eat and drinke bread and wine as we do, yee cannot ſay they were the ſame Sacraments with ours; and thus have I refuted your ſecond argument.

Your third argument followes, which is this:

There is one and the ſame conſideration of the firſt fruits and the lump the root and the branches: But the firſt fruits and roote beliſeving Parents are holy and muſt be Baptized, therefore Infants the lump and branches are holy and muſt be Baptized.

I deny the aſſumption or ſecond part of your argument, aſſumed out of the firſt, *viz.* That believing Parents are the roote or firſt fruites; neither doth, *Rom.* 11. 16. nor the 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. prove any ſuch thing; we will conſider of the places diſtinctly, and firſt of the firſt, in *Rom.* 11. 18. It is ſaid (ſpeaking to the believing Gentiles) boaſt not thy ſelfe againſt the branches, for if thou boaſt thy ſelfe thou beareſt not the roote but the roote thee; now if they beare not the roote but the roote beareth them, then they cannot bee the roote, and yet they ſtood by Faith verſe the 20. and were but branches, verſe 21. this firſt place is therefore abuſed to make beleiving parents the firſt fruits and roote, and their Infants naturally deſcended from them to be the branches, whereas beleivers are but branches themſelves: and ſecondly, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. doth prove no ſuch thing neither, which as it neither expreſſeth roote nor firſt fruites, ſo hath it no ſuch ſence and meaning as that the holineſſe of Faith in the parents, ſhould cauſe the holineſſe in the children.

But before I expreſſe my reaſons of the expoſition, either negative or affirmative, I conceive it neceſſary to obſerve what you ſay (on the contrary you ſay, *you ſuppoſe it is miſtaken when expounded to be the ſame holineſſe ſpoken before of Infidels perſon ſanctified to the beleiver*, and further you ſay, *the Apoſtle ſpeaking therefore of a two-fold holineſſe, the one (not) in the thing it ſelfe but to anothers uſe, the other of the thing it ſelfe is cannot but be ſinfull to confound them.*

To which I anſwer, that I will not contend nor gainſay any of this, but further you ſay.

That the Apoſtle ſaith two things, that to the pure all things are pure, and ſanctified; therefore a beleiving husband or wife may dwell with an

Infidell

Infidell yoake-fellow, the ſecond thing is, that by vertue of a beleivers ſtate in grace, all his fruite is holy, and partakers of the ſame ſtate of grace, with him, unleſſe they doe by ſome act of theirs deprive themſelves of it as Eſau, Iſhmael, &c.

To which I anſwer, that the former of theſe two things, I grant, but the latter I wholy deny, that it is any of the purpoſe of *Paul* ſo to ſpeake.

For firſt, it is the purpoſe of *Paul* to conclude ſuch a holineſſe in the children, as was inſeparable to their very being, or elſe it would not have been a ſufficient reaſon to have proved the ſanctification of the unbelieving yoke-mate by the believer, and therefore to ſuppoſe ſome Act of theirs to deprive them of the holineſſe there ſpoken of is a coarcted and farre fetch't expoſition.

Secondly, if by a believers ſtate in grace be underſtood the covenant that *Abraham* and all believers doe poſſeſſe by faith: then firſt I ſay, that *Eſau* nor *Iſhmael* were never of it, *Rom.* 9. 8. and therfore could not by any Act of theirs deprive themſelves of it.

Secondly, if they were and deprived by ſome Act of theirs; then we muſt fall upon *Arminius* tenet of falling away which underſtanding Chriſtians doe utterly abhorre.

Thirdly, then the being in the everlaſting covenant of grace, and peace with God by Chriſt, ſhould be conveyed and derived by naturall deſcent, and not by the Goſpell, which is abſurd and contrary to many Scriptures, *Rom.* 1 16, 17. chap. 10. 17. *Gallathians* 3. 2. *Ioh.* 3. 5. 1 *Pet.* 1, 23. *Iam.* 1. 18. *Ioh.* 1. 13.

The firſt of theſe Scriptures ſaith the Goſpell is the power of God to ſalvation to every one that believeth; whereas this poſition ſaith, that ſome are partakers of a ſtate of grace and ſalvation by vertue of their parents, being in the ſtate of grace, which is directly contrary the one to the other: and all the other Sriptures, and many more proves that Faith *comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*. by which converſion and regeneration is wrought, by which onely and alone we become Sons of God by adoption and grace; now therfore to ſay that ſome are partakers of the ſame by generation,

by vertue from their parents is directly contrary, yea contrary to the whole Gospell of Christ, *Rom.* 4. 14. where the Apostle saith, if they which be of the Law (that is naturally descended and circumcised onely) be Heires: Faith is made voyde and the promise (that is, the whole Gospell or Covenant of grace) is made of none effect.

But if you meane by a State of grace such favour as it pleased God to bestow upon the posterity of *Abraham*, according to the flesh whereby (being circumcised) they were segregated and distinguished to be possessed of Ordinances leading them to Christ, which was then to come above other neighbour Nations: I grant that this distinction agrees to them yet nevertheless: to this I say first that this distinction was taken away at the death of Christ *Ephes.* 2. 14 15. *Act.* 10. 28.

Secondly, neither is it *Pauls* purpose to conclude these children spoken of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. within the Limits of such a distinction, first because the Lord in the time of the Law did accompt of children, in the very case and consideration that these children were in, to be a polluted and unholy seed, and to be put away with their Mothers which were not members of the Church according to the Law, *Ezra*, 9. 2. 10. 3. Therefore that State did not alow even while it lasted children to be of that state, when one of the parents were forreigners to the Church, therefore much lesse hath it any consequence to conclude it, so now when the State it selfe is nullifyed.

Thirdly, in the time of the Law from which this successive being in the state of grace, is concluded to come the Protelite Jew was required to circumcise all his males, *Exod.* 12. 48. and he should be as one that was borne in the Land, and it must bee conceived that the Females were included in the Males, and did enter into the state with them; there being no circumcision, or other Sacrament of entrance appointed for them, whereupon it followeth that there can be no President or rule, no not in the time of the Law it selfe; that ever any one parent comming to be of the *Jewish* state and leaving their maried yoke-mate out did possesse their seed of the same state, and the reason was because the Law did injoyne the Protelite to possesse all of the state that were under his Jurisdiction by the authority of that Law which required him to circumcise all his males. And

And therefore the ſtate now which takes in upon Faith onely, and thereupon takes the husband which believeth and leaves out the wife which beleiveth not, and takes the wife which beleiveth, and leaves out the husband which believeth not; can receive no rule from that ſtate to take in the children before they doe believe no more then the wife which then was brought into that ſtate by the law of the husbands being a Proſelite, and left out of this ſtate untill ſuch time as they doe believe,

Fourthly, the Apoſtle ſpeakes indefinitly of their Children young or old, which it may be, ſome were 10, 20 or 30. yeares old; and it muſt be conſidered, that age doth not make them ceaſe to be Children in relation to thoſe Parents, whoſe children they are, and againe it muſt be conſidered, that *Pauls* purpoſe is not to ſpeake of Children in reſpect of yeares, but in reſpect of relation only for his Argument is an Argument of relation.

Now it is an abſurdity of ſuch a nature, as no body I thinke will owne to conclude, that Children of 20 or 30 yeares old which are apparently wicked, are holy in ſuch a ſenſe as by vertue of their Parents ſtate in grace to be partakers of the ſame ſtate of grace with him, ſo as to be Baptized by vertue of this relation.

Therefore holyneſſe here cannot in the Apoſtles meaning be ſo underſtood, neither will the exception take it off, (*viz.*) unleſſe they do by ſome act of theirs deprive themſelves of it) as *Eſau* and *Iſhmael*, *&c.*

To which I Anſwer, that the Apoſtle ſpeakes poſitively of a concluſion drawne from the State of the relation which can admit of no exception, which if it could, then will it bee of no abſolute validity to enforce the concluſion; and according to this Argument if the Children doe by ſome Act of theirs deprive themſelves of their eſtate in grace, then their Parents can have no ſanctified uſe of their unbeleiving yoak mate though they have never ſo much faith in themſelves; whereas contrary to this the Apoſtle ſaith, to the pure all things are pure *Tit* 1. 15. without reference to the children, therefore the childrens ſtate in grace or not in grace, addeth not nor diminiſheth any thing to that purpoſe.

Fiftly,

Fiftly, therfore I ſay that the holineſſe ſpoken of here, is ſuch a holyneſſe as muſt prove the unbelieving Parent ſanctified to (or by) their unbelieving yoke-mate, but if the Parents be not lawfully married, the grace of the child (if it have any though never ſo much) cannot prove the unbelieving Parent ſanctified to or by their believing yoke-mate: Now if any ſhall object, that if their Parents were not lawfully married, then were they not huſband and wife each to other: I anſwer: that upon the ſame ground that the Corinthians did queſtion the dwelling with their unbelieving yok-mate, upon the ſame ground they did queſtion their being lawfully huſbands and wives each to other, which if they were not, all the grace that can be imagined in the Children, will never prove the unbelieving Parent ſanctified to or by their believing yoke-mate, therefore the holyneſſe here ſpoken of is not a ſtate of grace, neither inward nor outward neither, ſeeing that anſwers not the Corinthians ſcruple, nor proves the thing in queſtion by them.

Sixtly, therefore I anſwer poſitively, that the holyneſſe here ſpoken of is legitimacy, and the uncleaneſſe Baſterdy, and the reaſon is partly becauſe ſuch an expoſition hath force to prove the thing in queſtion, and the other hath not; and partly becauſe ſuch a holyneſſe is derivative from all Parents lawfully married, and the other is not. *Mal.* 2 15. and it muſt be ſuch a holyneſſe as is derivative from all Parents lawfully married becauſe one of the Parents being come to the Faith, and the argument ſtanding in the Children which were begotten and borne before, which therefore could not receive any vertue from the faith of the Parents by the courſe of generation to have any holyneſſe thereby derived unto them; Therefore it muſt be ſuch a holyneſſe as is derivative from all Parents lawfully married, and that is no other then Legitimacy, and that ſuch an expoſition of holyneſſe ſo underſtood hath force ſufficient to prove the thing in queſtion, is cleare; becauſe if one of the Parents do believe there can no objection be made why Legitimacy ſhould not prove the unbelieving Parent to be ſanctified to or by the believing yoke-mate, whereas if there be no children Legitimate, the queſtion may lie as it did with the Corinthians, whether they were bound together as husband and wife, and

whether

whether the unbeliever be ſanctified to the believing yokemate, yea or no: but taking it for granted that they have Children each by other legitimate, it is then out of queſtion; the concluſion then is, that there can be no ſuch holyneſſe underſtood of Children in this place of *Paul* as by which they muſt be Baptiſed: and thus is your third Argument refuted.

Your fourth Argument is this, *If Baptiſme ſucceed Circumciſion then if Infants were to be Circumciſed, Infants are to be Baptiſed; but Baptiſme ſucceeds Circumciſion, therefore as Infants were to be Circumciſed ſo Infants are to be Baptiſed.*

To which I anſwer, I deny the conſequence of the propoſition for it doth not follow, becauſe Baptiſme in a ſenſe ſucceeddeth Circumciſion, that therefore the ſame ſubjects that were to be Circumciſed then, are to be Baptiſed now; no more then this conſequence, the Goſpell ſucceeds the Law, the Sons of *Aaron* were Miniſters of the Law, therefore the Sons of *Aaron* are to be Miniſters now, or no more then this, Baptiſme ſucceeds Circumciſion, then if they Circumciſed all the Males ſervants though they were men and had no Faith, then ſo they are to Baptiſe them now; and ſo in reſtriction, alſo Baptiſme ſucceeds Circumciſion, Females were not to be Circumciſed then though they had Faith, therefore not to be Baptiſed now: or thus; the Lords Supper ſucceeds the Paſſeover then if the little Children and ſervants eate it, namely the Paſſover, with the reſt of the Family diſtinctly by themſelves in a houſe, then ſo are little children and ſervants to eate the Lords Supper with the reſt of the Family diſtinctly in one houſe by themſelves now: and is this good reaſon? and yet what ever objection can be made againſt any of theſe conſequences, will lie againſt yours alſo.

Secondly, I ſay the body of the Jewiſh Nation were ſubjects Circumciſed according to the Law, even when Chriſt died, yet the ſame were not ſubjects of Baptiſme according to the Goſpell untill they gladly received the word of God, *Act.* 2. 41.

Thirdly, therefore I anſwer, that as Baptiſme ſucceeds Circumciſion, ſo doth the commandement of Baptiſme ſucceed the commandement of Circumciſion, and the Subject commanded to be Baptiſed doth ſucceed the ſubject commanded

to be Circumciſed: as therefore of old when perſons were to be Circumciſed, they had recourſe to the commandement of Circumciſion for direction of themſelves in the parties to be circumciſed; ſo now ought we to have recourſe to the commandement of Baptiſme for direction of our ſelves in the parties to be Baptiſed, now therfore for to have recourſe to the commandement of Circumciſion, for to have direction in the parties to be Baptiſed, is not onely a failing in method, order, and good decorum, but alſo cauſeth a neceſsity of erring, becauſe the commandement of Circumciſion and the commandement of Baptiſme is of different ſubjects; and if we ſhould take the parties to be Baptiſed from the commandement of Circumciſion, then we muſt Baptiſe none but Males, and that on the eighth day too; and the Proſelyte muſt Baptiſe all his Males whether they have Farth or no, and the Females muſt noo be baptiſed though they have never ſo much faith; wheras contrariwiſe the commandement of baptiſme requireth the baptiſme of Diſciples, and onely Diſciples, and that both men and women, *Mat.* 28. 18. *Ioh* 4. 1, 2. *act.* 2. 38. 41. *chap.* 8. 12. 37. *chap.* 16. 47. *Gal.* 3. 26. 27. 28, 29. and what is the deſcription of a Diſciple, ſee *Luke* 14. 26, 27, 33.

Fourthly, That which was the reaſon of the change of the Sacrament was the reaſon of the change of the ſubject which the Sacrament was to be adminiſtred unto, wherupon it followeth that by the ſame reaſon that we take Infants to be baptiſed, becauſe Infants were formerly Circumciſed, by the ſame reaſon we may Circumciſe them now, becauſe they Circumciſed them then and ſo conſequently the queſtion of baptiſme ended, unleſſe it ſhould be pleaded, that Infants ſhould be baptiſed and circumciſed both: Now if it be abſurd to circumciſe Infants now, notwithſtanding they circumciſed them then, becauſe Chriſt is now come, who hath put an end to Circumciſion and all the Ceremonies of the Law; ſurely it is no leſſe abſurd to baptiſe Infants now in relation to their circumciſing of them then, becauſe Chriſts coming doth put an end to the ſubject alſo, and hath inſtituted another Subject to be Baptiſed, and they are thoſe that firſt taught to believe in Chriſt, and onely thoſe; and thus is the conſequence of baptiſme ſucceeding circumciſion taken away.

And

And thus have I made a full anſwer to your diſcourſe touching *Infants Baptiſme*, and now it remaines I ſhould make ſome anſwere to your diſcourſe touching the forme of the Church.

And firſt you ſpeake of *Agreement* in this, *viz. That matter and forme do conſtitute a Church, (to which we do agree)*

Alſo you ſay, *That the matter is a company of viſible Saints, profeſſing faith in the right conſtitution of Chriſt, and living accordingly.*

To this I anſwer, that this definition agreeth not to Infants, which you would make the ſubjects of baptiſme, who are borne in ſinne, and are by nature the children of wrath, *Pſal.* 51. 5. *Epheſ.* 2. 3.

Secondly, neither doth it agree with the conſtitution of the Jewiſh Church (which you make to be a patterne for ours, by bringing your grounds from thence for the baptiſing of Infants) who never were required to make any ſuch profeſsion at the time of their admiſſion, as all the Churches ſince Chriſts coming are, and all the Members added, or to be added, do when they are added, *Act.* 2. 41. *chap.* 8. 12, 13. 37, 38. 10. 47. 11. 15, 16, 17.

So then after you have ſet down wherein we do agree, (as indeed it were well if you did agree with your ſelfe in it) then you make a Quære *whether Baptiſme be not the forme of it*, and your anſwer is *No*, and then you give your reaſons of that denyall, and then you affirme, *That a Covenant acted is the forme*; to all which I anſwer, firſt in generall, that we are to diſtinguiſh betwixt that which formeth and the forme which is formed, becauſe the forme of any thing according to the common and vulgar acception of forme is that outward frame faſhion or figure that the thing hath, wherby it is diſtinguiſhed or hath its denomination, and to apply it to the queſtion in hand, the Church being an Aſſembly, the forme, faſhion, or figure thereof is the relation or ſtate that every Member poſſeſſeth from Chriſt their King and common head, and each with other, wherby every Law in every office or ſervice is communicable and executed; ſo then neither Baptiſme nor a Covenant is the forme of the Church, but Baptiſme of believers is the inſtrumentall meanes by which the Church commeth to be made partakers of that forme which it hath, and by which it comes to be a Church,

and to have ſuch a name ſetled upon it, and without which it can have no ſuch name agree unto it.

The inſtrnmentall meanes then of the being of this Church, both for matter and forme is by conſent of love, iſſuing forth from the Covenant of grace made in from one Lord through one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptiſme: *Eph.* 4. 4, 5. and if any of theſe meanes be wanting, then ſomething is wanting that cauſeth the Church to be, and except that want be ſupplied, the Church can have no viſible exiſtence or being, and from hence the concluſion ariſeth, that although Baptiſme be not the forme, frame, faſhion, or figure of the Church, yet ſeeing Baptiſme is an eſſentiall part of the meanes conducing to the being of the viſible Church, yea and the laſt meanes too; That where true Baptiſme is wanting, there can be no true viſible Church.

Secondly, wherſoever true baptiſme is adminiſtred according to the will of Chriſt revealed in the Scripture, *there the true viſible Church is by that meanes, truely conſtituted and ſtated in his true being.*

It is therefore called the birth of water, *Joh.* 3. 5. *Titus* 3. 5. As therefore the birth which we receive from our naturall Parents, is that by which we receive the beginning of our natures being among the common ſtate of mankinde in the affaires of this corporall life, even ſo Baptiſme being the birth of water, is that whereby we receive the beginning of our viſible being in our Spirituall eſtate among the Church and people of God, in the affaires appertaining to eternall life, but the firſt is true from the analogy that baptiſme hath with naturall birth, therefore the ſecond by force of conſequence is alſo true.

Secondly, I argue from the forme of baptiſme, it being a dipping of the body into the water and in that reſpect called a burial with Chriſt, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. betokening our death and reſurrection.

As therefore the riſing out of the grave at the laſt day is the beginning of our being bodily in the ſtate of glory, ſo the riſing out of the water of baptiſme is the beginning of our being in the viſible ſtate of grace, and the beginning of our viſible ſpirituall life is from that day, *&c.* in reſpect of their outward ſtation.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I argue from the end for which baptiſme is appointed, which amongſt other, is to unite them to the viſible body of Chriſt, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 27. 28. Eph. 4. 5. 6. and to diſtinguiſh them from the reſt of the world which are not baptiſed as they are, Col. 2. 12. compared 20. and to circumciſion did diſtinguiſh and denominate the Proſelite Jewes from what they were before, and from all other Heathens Ex. 12. 48 49. Ro. 3. 1. 2.

From whence I reaſon thus; if union and communion with the viſible body of Chriſt, and diſtinguiſhment from the reſt of the world be the end for which baptiſme is appointed, then whenſoever it is adminiſtred according to appointment, it muſt neceſſarily be concluded to be ſuch a meanes as is effectuall to accompliſh the propoſed end, and unleſſe baptiſme as a meanes be adminiſtred to perſons which are believers, ſubjects only capable of ſuch union, communion, and diſtinction, ſuch an end can no waies elſe be effected, and that way it may be and is; but the former is true by the ground before laid, *Ergo* the latter is alſo true.

Fourthly, I argue from the Irreiteration of baptiſme, it being to be adminiſtred but once, the Lords Supper often, in which reſpect baptiſme is the ſigne of our birth, the Lords Supper is the ſigne of our growth; baptiſme is the Sacrament of our entrance or initiation, the Lords Supper is the Sacrament of our continuance and conſervation in the viſible body of Chriſt, and therefore by the ſame reaſon that a man may be conceived to have a being in the viſible Church for a time without baptiſme the ſigne and Sacrament of his birth, entrance and initiation by the ſame reaſon he may have a continuance of his being there without the ſame alſo, and ſo conſequently baptiſme needleſſe: but baptiſme is not needleſſe but needfull. (being a ſigne of our birth, entrance and initiation) to be adminiſtred as a meanes of our viſible birth, entrance initiation or the beginning of our viſible being in the viſible body of Chriſt (which therefore in that reſpect is called the birth of water) which thereby do viſibly enter into the Covenant of Grace.

Therefore without baptiſme they have noe viſible being in the Church, and by it they have.

Fiftly, I argue from the nature of baptiſme as it is a ſeale of

the Covenant, and so consequently a part of the Covenant, an Ordinance of mutuall ingagement between God and man, *Act.* 2.38. chap.22.16. 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. even as circumcision was an ingagement to all the duties or Ordinances of the Law, *Gal* 5. 3. so is Baptisme an ingagement to all the Ordinances of the Gospell, which is therfore called Christs bond or yoke, *Psal.* 2. 3. *Mat.* 11.29. his badge or livery of his professed Disciples, there being no other visible Ordinance of God appointed to passe upon persons, to note out their being in the Covenant before this; from hence I reason.

They that are baptised upon profession of Faith have sealed to the covenant, & are known thereby to belong to the covenant, and so have a visible being in the same, whereas they that are not baptised by vertue of profession of Faith by them made cannot by any Ordinance of God be knowne to belong thereunto.

But God hath appointed some Ordinance to be administred upon persons which make profession of Faith, whereby they may be visibly knowne to belong to the covenant of grace whereas others that partake not thereof cannot be so knowne, and there is nothing before Baptisme appointed so to doe.

Therefore Baptisme administred to persons professing Faith and repentance, is it alone by which they may be knowne according to Gods Ordinance, to be in the covenant of grace, and to be of the visible body of Christ.

Lastly, I argue from the Commission for Baptisme, *Mat.* 28 18. given to the first, which was, that they should make Disciples all Nations baptising them, where note that baptising is a *participle* to the making of them, to beare the name of Disciples or Shollers in Christs schoole, hereupon the words of Christ in the Commission *Mar.* 16. 16. are, *he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved*; Faith puts a man into the State of salvation before God: Baptisme before men; and assoone as they were Disciples baptised, and so stated a visible assembly, then to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them, ver. 19. where note, they were first to be a Church of Christ; Secondly, they were to doe and observe as a Church of Christ, from whence I reason.

If the Commission for Baptisme given to the first Church-planters

planters of the new Testament, did require Baptisme, and that only to be administred upon persons, as the last thing to make Disciples or Schollers in Christs schoole, in a visible state of salvation, seated in the observation of all the rest of the Ordinances of Christs Kingdome, then Baptisme administred upon those which are first taught, is that by which the true visible Church is constituted, and stated in its true being: but the former appeares by the ground before laid. *Ergo.*

Thus have I cleared and proved my position, that Baptisme is the thing or instrument and meanes forming and constituting of the Church, though it bee not the outward fashion, frame, figure, or forme of the Church formed; yet never heleſſe becauſe your Arguments seeme to lye against the question thus stated, I will consider them in order as they lie. First therefore you say, *that which giveth being to a Church must be removed, if the Church cease to be a Church.*

But Baptisme cannot be removed from a Church.

To which I answer, that it is as easie to remove Baptisme from a Church, as to remove a Church from being a Church.

Secondly, you say *that which being wanting to a Church constituted, doth not cause it to be no Church, that cannot be the forme of the Church,*

But Baptisme may be wanting in a Church constituted, and yet it be a Church as circumcision to them. Joshua 5. *Ergo.*

Answer, I deny the second proposition namely, that Baptisme may be wanting in a Church constituted, becauſe it is constituted by Baptisme, as we have prov'd before, neither will, *Ioshua* 5 helpe you herein, the case of the Israelites being extraordinary, having speciall dispensation from God himselfe in the supply of miraculous Sacraments in the cloud and Sea, Manna and the rock 1 *Cor* 10. 1. 2. which God gave them while their travailes necessarily required the forbearance of circumcision, and the Passeover, which if such necessity had not been, would not have beene dispenced with, but the parties so neglecting should have been cut off, *Gen.* 17. 14. If it be replyed they were members of the Church of Israel yet not circumcised: therfore we may be members now though not baptised. I deny the consequence, unleſſe that any can shew the like case and president of the supply of miraculous Sacraments, to serve in their room; which when

when they can, we will then grant that those new meanes from God may serve to effect the same thing, which till then we must be contented with the rule of his Word, namely, to have the Church constituted by baptising of believers in ordinary cases, and not otherwise.

Thirdly you say, *That which is but an adjunct to a thing cannot be the forme of it: but Baptisme is but an adjunct of a Church*: Ergo.

To which I answere, this argument lyeth not against my question, as I have stated it, because that which is but an adjunct may be a meanes of forming and constituting of the thing to which it is adjoyned: so Baptisme being administred upon believers, may be a meanes to constitute and forme them into a true visible Church-state.

Fourthly, you say, *That which is the seale of the Covenant, cannot be the forme of the Church: but Baptisme is the seale of the Covenant*, Ergo.

To which I answere, That which is the seale of the Covenant may be a meanes to constitute and put the Church into an outward visible form, for the which I have spoken somwhat before in the 5. Argument: unto which I referre the Reader for brevities sake.

Fifthly you say, *That which remaines when a man is no Church-member and is not to be administred to restore him unto Membership, that cannot be the forme of the Church.*

But Baptisme remaines when a man is no Church-member, *Ergo*.

To which I answer denying the assumption, but yet because many seeme to stumble at this argument most, I will indeavour a more satisfactory answer.

That by which a person professeth Christ with, is that onely by which he truely professeth Baptisme and Membership with the Church and body of Christ; whereupon it followeth, that upon the same reason that any person is dispossessed of Membership with the Church, upon the same reason he must be concluded to be dispossessed of Christ and of Baptisme also, and the reason is because he is to be concluded destitute of all the ends for which Baptisme is appointed. yea and the grounds also upon which it is administred; in that he possesseth not

Christ

Chriſt, he poſſeſſeth neither ground of Baptiſme, nor end, and therefore no true being of Baptiſme it ſelfe.

As for the reſtoring of a perſon to Membership, we are to note that repentance is but an effect of the ſame faith by which he poſſeſſed Chriſt at firſt, and by which he had right to, and poſſeſſed Baptiſme in deed, and in truth, though it did ſeem otherwiſe to us whiles error or ſin did appeare to be predominate in him, which repentance is that by which he is to be reſtor'd to communion with the Church againe after Excommunication, which if he repents not, and ſo hath no ſuch effect of faith appearing in him, by which he did apprehend Chriſt at firſt, then it doth appeare that he never did poſſeſſe Chriſt the ground of Baptiſme, and conſequently not Baptiſme in its true being: for though men may deceive themſelves, and may deceive other men like themſelves, yet they cannot deceive God, whoſe Ordinance it is, and upon whom Baptiſme and all other divine Ordinances have their dependance, who hath ordained that onely believers ſhould be baptiſed, which if therefore men have no faith though they pretend to have faith, then have they no right to Baptiſme before God, who knoweth them to be deſtitute of faith. Yet becauſe they ſeeme to men to whom the power of ſuch adminiſtration is committed, to have faith, they therfore are bound to baptiſe them; yet hath this baptiſme no true being from God, unleſſe and untill the parties do believe in deed and in truth, as they ſeeme to do by their profeſsion.

By all which it doth appeare plainly, that in *every Excommunicate perſon*, there is a neceſſary and unavoydable miſtake of him firſt or laſt, either therefore firſt he was no believer, and ſo had no right to baptiſme, and ſo baptiſme had no true being in him, although he ſeemed to have faith, or elſe ſecondly he is a believer, when Excommunicate, and hath Chriſt and baptiſme in its true being, although now through the prevalency of error or ſinne he ſeemed to have no faith.

Therefore from hence it followeth, that as a man falleth from his faith, he falleth from his baptiſme too, and as he returnes to his faith ſo he returnes to his baptiſme againe alſo; then if he ſeemeth to fall from his faith and doth it not really then ſo likewiſe he ſeemeth to fall from his baptiſme alſo. Then likewiſe

wiſe if he fall wholly from the faith indeed, which he profeſſed to have, as a man may do, then doth he fall wholly from his baptiſme indeed, and ſhall never have benefit by it.

From whence I reaſon, as a man cleaveth to his baptiſme ſo he cleaveth to the Church which is conſtituted by it, but as a man forſakes his Baptiſme ſo hee forſakes the Church.

But he that forſakes the ground and ends of baptiſme forſakes baptiſme which is adminiſtred upon thoſe grounds, and apointed for thoſe ends. *Ergo*

Baptiſme cannot be concluded to remaine when a man is no Church Member indeed and in truth.

Secondly I reaſon, he that returneth to his baptiſme, returneth to the Church which is conſtituted by it.

But he that returneth to the grounds and ends for which it is appointed and upon which it is adminiſtred, returneth to baptiſme in reſpect of its true being. *Ergo*

Hee that returneth to baptiſme returneth to the Church which is conſtituted by it.

And thus have I done with the negative arguments, and now I come to the affirmative, firſt therefore you ſay, *That an outward Covenant acted betweene God and a company of believers to become one and anothers, and ſo the like amongſt themſelves is the forme of a Church.*

To which I anſwer, that the Covenant of God makes the Church, I grant, but that any can be concluded to have an outward being in the Covenant of the Goſpell now in the time of the Goſpell without baptiſme, is it which I deny, and require you to prove, having formerly proved the contrary.

But whereas you ſpeake of a company of believers acting a Covenant to become one anothers amongſt themſelves to be the forme of the Church.

To which I anſwer, that by the ſame reaſon, that if a Covenant acted to becom one & anothers amongſt themſelves, ſhould be the forme of the Church without being baptiſed for the preſent, by the ſame reaſon they may receiue the forme of the Church without all the adminiſtrations of the Goſpell for the future, which I conceive would be abſurd to affirme.

Secondly, neither is there any warrant that God hath appointed

ted men to *act any ſuch covenant* for any *ſuch end*, and therefore ſo to do is will-worſhip, vanity, the invention of man, and mens inventions in Gods worſhip are plaine ſuperſtitions and flat breaches of the ſecond commandement, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe, &c.*

And therefore if it be the forme of the Church, it muſt needs be a Superſtitious Church, which is formed by ſuch a *Superſtitious action.*

Thirdly, a Covenant acted by believers to become one and anothers amongſt themſelves, may be with ignorance both of the nature and duties of a true Church, as is proved by the preſuppoſition of it to be the forme of the Church without baptiſme, how then ſhould it be the forme of the Church, for if they be ignorant that the viſible Church muſt ſubſiſt of baptiſed ones, how can it be avoyded, but that they are ignorant of the nature of the true viſible Church? and being ignorant of the nature thereof, they are neceſſarily ignorant of the duties thereof: for if they conceive that perſons ſhould be imployed in the ſervices of relation in the Church unbaptiſed, then they be ignorant of the duties of the Church, becauſe all the externall ſervices of relation muſt flow from the viſible union and relation made in baptiſme, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *chap.* 12. 13. *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. *Eph.* 5. 26. Col. 2. 12. 20. compared *chap.* 3. 1. 2. *Heb.* 10. 22, 23, 24, 25. therefore it cannot be the forme of Chriſts true viſible Church.

But let us examine your proofes, you ſay *Firſt, if the Kingdome of Heaven that is the Church-ſtate that we now have be the ſame that the Iewes had, then what was the forme of that is the forme of this.*

To which I anſwer, that if the Church-ſtate we have now, be not the ſame with theirs, then the forme of that is not the forme of this: and then your argument is grounded upon an if; that is upon nothing: but the Church-ſtate we have now, is not the ſame that the Jewes had, that being conſtituted of a naturall ſeed, according to the courſe of a naturall generation, this being conſtituted of a Spirituall ſeed according to Gods gracious effectuall working by the powerfull preaching of the Goſpell by Spirituall regeneration, *Act.* 2. 41. *Ergo*

Secondly, whereas you ſaid a little before, that a Covenant

acted by believers to become one anothers amongst themselves to be the forme of the Church, and then argue from the State of the Jewes to prove this forme which never did forme themselves so this; therefore surely tends to overthrow your selfe, and to argue from your proofe to overthrow your principle.

But you say, *That the forme of the Jewish Church-state was such a Covenant as is by you above expressed, this you cleare by 4 particulars as you say. first their entrance into it with Abraham and his seed, was by a visible and outward Covenant, into which Reprobates aswell as Elect were admitted, as* Ishmaell *and* Esaw, Gen. 17. *and Circumcision was not the Covenant but a token of the Covenant*, ver. 11

First I answer, this proues not the forme of the Church to be such a Covenant as is by you above expressed, acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, for *Abraham* and his seed, Reprobates aswell as Elect enter into it: Now *Abraham* was but one believer, and *Ishmaell* his seed which entred with him, you instance to be a Reprobate.

Secondly I answer, that Circumcision was not only a token of the Covenant but a part of the Covenant it selfe, being that whereby the parties circumcised were bound to keepe the whole Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. and therefore God saith, *Gen.* 17,10. This is my Covenant let every Man-child be circumcised, and ver. 13 He that is borne in thine house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, so shall my Covenant be in your flesh: but the uncircumcised Man-child, in whose flesh the fore-skin is not circumcised, even that person shall be cut off from his people, because he hath broken my Covenant: therefore the Covenant here spoken of was such as was entred into by Circumcision, and not such as was acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves to be the forme of the Church

But you would seeme to cleare it by a *second particular* (viz) *by the establishment of it in the plaine of* Moab.

But this establishment was by a Church-Covenant Deut. 29. 10. 16. *in which they avouched God to be their God, and God avouched they were his people.* Deut. 26. 17. 18. *neither could circumcision be any ingredient here, because they had not circumcised any of* 40. *yeares ever since*

ſince they came out of Egypt; nor did they circumciſe any till after Moſes *and* Joſhua, *had brought them through Iordan into the Land of Canaan*, Joſhua. 5. 5.

To this I anſwer, that this covenant which was now eſtabliſhed, with the people of Iſrael in the plaine of *Moab*, was the ſame covenant which was made with *Abram*, *Iſaac* and *Iacob*, v. 13. which they entered into with God in the behalfe of themſelves, and their poſterity by being circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 compared 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. *Act.* 7, 8. and therefore being in the covenant before, they did not begin to be a Church now, and therefore this proves not that a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers, ſhould be it, that ſhould conſtitute them to be a Church now.

Secondly, whereas you ſay, *neither was circumciſion any ingredient here, becauſe they had not circumciſed any of* 40. *yeares*, I anſwer, I conceive notwithſtanding, that circumciſion was an ingredient in their parents who thereby entered into a covenant for themſelves, and theſe children even as the covenant here ſpecified, did comprehend the poſterity to come, ver. 15.

Thirdly, the caſe of the Iſraelites was extraordinary, having ſpeciall diſpenſation from God, in the ſupply of miraculous Sacraments, and ſignes of his grace as meanes of manifeſtation, in ſpeciall of the teſtification of the covenant, as leading them through the red Sea dry, giving the cloudy pillar by day, and the Pillar of fire by night, to guide and defend them miraculouſly, cauſing their clothes and ſhoes to remaine ſutable to their bodies and feete, without new ſupplies, and without waxing old, who were fed miraculouſly without bread, even by *Manna*, and water out of the Rock, that they might thereby know that he was the Lord their God. *Deut.* 29. 5. 6. Whiles their travailes neceſſarily required the forbearance of Circumciſion, and the Paſſeover, which neceſsity if it had not been; it ſhould not have been ſo diſpenced with. *Numbers* 9 13. *Gen.* 17 14. which neceſsity, ſeeing it came to paſſe by Gods commanding them to journey in the Wilderneſſe, therefore did in the roome of Circumciſion for that time, ſupply with ſuch miraculous Sacraments which are no rules in ordinary caſes, as may appeare by their ceſſation aſſoone as they came into the Land of *Canaan*,

who then were presently led by ordinary rules, as circumcision, and the Passeover, *Iosh.* 5. wherefore in ordinary cases circumcision was the distinction of Jew and Gentiles, and the meanes of the constitution of the Church of *Israel*, *Gen.* 17. 10. 11, 12 13, 14. *Exodus* 12. 48. *Act.* 7, 8. *Rom.* 3, 1, 2. *Ezek.* 44. 9. *Act.* 11. 2, 3. *chap.* 16. 1. 3. *Rom.* 2. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. *chap.* 3. 30. and 4. *Ephes.* 2. 11. *Phil.* 3. 2, 3. 5. *Col.* 2. 13. 1 *Sam.* 17. 26 36.

Hereupon it followeth, that although the Church of *Israel* were a people in covenant with God, yet the way of entrance into this covenant visibly, and so the constitution of this Church was ordinarily circumcision. Therefore as a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers, was not the forme of that Church then, but a speciall communication of Gods covenant by circumcision ordinarily, with the whole Nation believers and Infidells, and whosoever of any Nation that would be circumcised, and come to *Ierusalem* to worship; much lesse hath it any consequence to prove it so now.

But the the third particular by which you would cleare it, is by the Iewes, renewing themselves after some Apostacy, 2 Chron. 15. 12, 13. 16. *and* 34. 30. 31. *Neh.* 9. 38. 10. 1. From whence you reason.

That without which they could not stand in a right Church-estate, that is the forme of the Church, but without the renewall of their covenant, they could not stand in a right and pure Church-Estate. Ergo.

To the assumption I answer, that the Jewes made a covenant to seeke the God of their Fathers, I grant; that they did well in so doing, I grant also; but they could not be in a Church-state without so doing I deny, and you have not proved, and I will prove the contrary: first because they were the Church of God before. Secondly, that which was now renewed had a being before, and the making of this covenant was but animating, and inabling them to doe that which they were ingaged, and bound to doe before by their circumcision, *Gal.* 5. 3 and therefore as this renuing of their covenant is not by your Argument proved to be the forme of the Church, then much lesse hath it any consequence, to prove that a covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, is the forme of a Church now.

But

But the fourth particular by which you would cleare it, *is from their diſſolution*, from whence you reaſon thus.

That which being taken away makes them ceaſe to be a Church, that is, the forme of the Church, but the diſſolving of the covenant is the making of them ceaſe to be a Church. Ergo,

That the taking away of the covenant maketh them ceaſe to be a Church you ſay, *is cleare from* Zach. 11. 10. 14. *Whence it was propheſied off, and from the New Teſtament, whence it is ſhewed how it is accompliſhed after the death of Chriſt.*

To which I anſwer, firſt that the covenant of grace is eternall, the things thereof remaining unſhaken, the Kingdom that comes by it cannot be ſhaken, *Heb.* 12. 27, 28. the Ordinance of Baptiſme which belongs unto it, the fruit and benefit of it is eternall; the Church which is conſtituted by it is never diſſolved, but remaines to all eternity for it to be adminiſtred onely to believers, *Act.* 8. 37. And Chriſt ſaith, *hee that believeth in him ſhall never die. Iohn* 11. 26.

Secondly, as the taking away the covenant makes the Church to ceaſe: ſo it onely proves the covenant to be the ground of the Church, and the Church only to have a being, as it is ſtated upon that ground, and that is in participating in the covenant, and not otherwiſe: now the queſtion being of the viſible Church, then there muſt needs be a viſible participation of the covenant, or otherwiſe there can be no viſible being; now there was no viſible participation of the covenant made with the people of *Iſrael*, before the comming of Chriſt ordinarily, and by ordinance before circumciſion, neither is there any viſible participation of the covenant ſince Chriſt, by order of appointment without, or before Baptiſme: therefore circumciſion then, and Baptiſme now muſt be it, by which they are conſtituted, or concluded to have a viſible being in the covenant, and conſequently the Church to have a viſible being, in reſpect of this viſible participation in the covenant, whereupon it followeth, that if the covenant be diſſolved or ceaſeth, or be taken away, needs muſt the circumciſion or baptiſme, which is the ordinance of participation be diſſolved, ceaſe, or bee taken away, whereby their relation or being a viſible member doth conſiſt.

Now then, ſeeing that the covenant which was before Chriſt did

did cermonially lead to Christ, and is in that respect dissolved, ceased and taken away; then circumcision by which persons had visible participation thereof is also dissolved, ceased and taken away, and so consequently the visible Church of the Jewes ceased as was prophecied, *Zach.* 11. 10. 14. and was accomplished at the death of Christ at which time the partition wall was broken, *Act.* 2. 41. 10. 28. *Ephe.* 2. 13. 14 15.

And also seeing the covenant since Christ is ratified by the death and bloud of the Lord Jesus the Testator, cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased and taken away (as you your selfe affirme in your third proposition, and fourth period) then Baptisme administred upon believers, by which they have visible participation thereof, cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased, and taken away.

Therfore the true visible Church now in respect of the ground of it, cannot be removed, dissolved cease, or be taken away.

Onely two exceptions need explication: first the true Church may possibly die, and none survive them in the same visible state: *Ergo*, the true visible Church may be removed, dissolved, ceated, and taken away.

Secondly, persons may seeme to be, and not be true members of the true visible Church, which afterwards may shew themselves otherwise, and so the Church may ceale.

To the first I answer, that the cessation of the Church by death is but onely to our outward view, for to our Faith it is no more ceased, then their relation to the covenant is ceased, and the relation which the faithfull have in, and to the covenant when they die doth not cease; no more then the covenant it selfe, whereupon such a relation is grounded doth, which is as firme as God himselfe the maker of the covenant is.

Secondly as the outward view of the *Church* ceaseth, so the outward view of their relation to the Church by Baptisme ceaseth also, by which they had visible participation with the body of Christ and therefore this exception hinders not, but that the true visible Church of the New Testament constituted by the Baptisme of believers, by which they have visible participation cannot be removed, dissolved, ceased or taken away.

To the second exception I answer, that the covenant cannot properly

properly be ſaid to be diſſolved, or taken away from ſuch as only ſeemed to be in the covenant, and were not indeed and in truth in it, but when they manifeſt themſelves to bee what they are, they doe declare that they never were in covenant with Chriſt at all, and therefore the diſſolving of the Church, in reſpect of hypocrites, is not by diſſolving or taking of the covenant from them, but by diſcovering of them to be ſuch as never had any true right to Baptiſme, which therefore hath now no true being in them, and conſequently were never in the covenant, 1 *Iohn* 2 19.

From all which it doth appeare that the covenant (no not of God himſelfe) cannot be the forme of the Church, but only the ground whereupon the Church is ſtated, and it is conſtituted by participation, and viſibly by viſible participation, and that is onely Baptiſme, and the continuance in the Church, is the continuance of the manifeſtation of the ſame participation, poſſeſſed by Baptiſme, therefore Baptiſme of believers is the conſtitution of the viſible Church of Chriſt.

But from theſe 4. particulars, you argue, *That if an outward Covenant was the forme of the Church under the old Teſtament, then is it the forme of the Churches under the new Teſtament: But the former is true.* Ergo.

To which I anſwer, denying both antecedent and conſequent alſo: for if the Covenant of God himſelfe is not the forme of the Church of the old Teſtament (but only the ground upon which the Church was ſtated) much leſſe can it be ſaid that an outward Covenant acted by the people of Iſrael, a company of them to become one and anothers, is the form of the Church: but leaſt of all doth it prove ſuch a thing to forme the Church now: But the former is manifeſted by what is above ſaid: *Ergo.*

Your arguments from the new Teſtament follow. Firſt, but you further prove it from the new Teſtament, you ſay from *Mat.* 18. 20. *That it is a company not baptiſing themſelves, but gathering themſelves together in his name, where the word uſed doth properly and commonly ſignifie a Church aſſembling or ſynagoguiſing,* as *Joh.* 20. 19. *Act.* 4. 31. & 11. 26. 13. 44. & 14. 27. & 1 *Cor.* 15. 6. 30. & 20. 8. 1 5. 8.

To which I anſwere, that though it be a company not baptiſing themſelves, yet do none of the Scriptures prove that a company of unbaptiſed perſons have this name of true viſible Church given un-

o them: and therfore the assemb ing of persons meerly is not the Cause of that denomination in the Scripture sence: but when their Baptisme is the cause of their assembling, wherby they do assemble, in the name of Christ, in whose name they are Baptised, that is the reason why the Scripture affords them the denomination of Christs true visible Church; for they were the assemblies of D sciples, and Disciples were all Baptised, being first taught, *Ioh.*4.1.2. *Mat.*28.18.

You say, *Looke what makes a member of a Church to be a member, or no member, that makes a Church to be a Church or no Church: and so that is the forme of it, there is the same reason of the whole that is of every part.*

But *the making, or dismembering, or restoring of a member, is by a Covenant (acted, to become one and anothers)* Esay 56 4.6.

To which I answer, that the Covenant of God is the ground upon which the Church and every member therof is stated, I grant, and have formerly proved: but that a Covenant acted by any to become one and a nothers amongst themselves, should forme the member or Church, either is by me denyed; neither doth Esay 56.4 6 prove any such thing, for it only saith, The Eunuches that take hold of my Covenant, and the stranger that embraceth my Covenant, that is, were Circumcised, and performeth the duties which they were bound to performe by Circumcision, Gal.5,3. should have a place in his house, and not by acting a Covenant to become one and anothers, and neglecting of Circumcision.

3. You say *The comparison is of a Church with a candlestick* Rev. 1. 12.20. *looke what is the forme of a candlesticke, the same by proportion is the form of a Church; as the matter signifies the matter of a Church proportionably.*

But *the form of a candlesticke is the joyning toegether the shaft and the branches, which signifies Christ and many members united together, which cannot be but by agreement or Covenant.*

To which I answer, I grant the comparison and the proportion also, but that this cannot be but by an outward agreement or covenant acted by a company of believers to become one and anothers amongst themselves, is the thing that I deny; for persons may be united to Christ by faith and baptisme, and so stated in the Covenant of Grace, and members of the visible Church proportionably, like as the forme of a Candlestick is

the

the joyning together the shaft and the branches.

Fourthly, You say, *If the removing of the Candlestick, and so the unchurching of them be by dissolving of the Covenant and their fellowship as to them,* Zach. 11. 10 14. *by dissipation, then that was the forme of it.*

But removing of the Candlestick is the dissolving of the Covenant and their fellowship thereby; as to them by dissipation, Zach. 11. 10. 14.

Therefore that was the forme of it.

To which I answer, denying the second proposition, because the everlasting Covenant of the new Testament established by the blood of Christ, cannot be shaken, removed, dissolved, but remaineth for ever, *Heb.* 12. 27 28. 13 20. and therefore the Covenant upon which the Church is stated, now doth differ from that which was before the comming of Christ, upon which the Iewish Church was stated seeing that was dissoluble, but this is undissoluble, *Heb.* 8. 13. and therefore their Kingdom of heaven was shaken and taken away, *Zac.* 11. 10. 15. *Heb.* 12. 26, 27, 28. *Mat.* 21. 43. *Hag.* 2 7. and this Kingdome cannot be shaken and taken away in respect of the ground and foundation upon which it is built, *Heb.* 12. 28. *Mat.* 16, 18, 19.

And as for the removing of the Candlesticke, and so the unchurching them of them, it is only by a discovery or laying open, or manifestation of a people to bee void of any participation of the Covenant which formerly they professed, were esteemed, and had a name to have, 1 *Joh.* 2. 19. *Rev.* 3. 1. and not the dissolving or taking away of a Covenant from them, which once they had and injoyed, much lesse is it the dissolving the outward Covenant, acted by a covenant of believers, to become one and all others amongst themselves: The unchurching of them, which as the acting of it is will-worship, and no ordinance of God, and so the church so constituted meerly Antichristian, so the dissolving of such Covenant cannot be the unchurching of any true churches, because Iesus Christ hath no Churches, in true visible being so constituted.

FINIS.

Some

Some Principall matters handled in this BOOKE.

1 THAT the old Covenant is one and the same as well betweene the time of Abraham and Moses as between the time of Moses and Christ, page 3, 4.

2 The typicall nature of the old Covenant with the cessation thereof described. page, 11, 12. 15, 16.

3 That the Covenant now since Christ is not the same that was before with Abrahams posterity in the flesh. page 12. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

4 That the grace of God is never the more straitned, but inlarged to our seed after the flesh, though they be not in the Covenant, now as they are our seed according to the flesh. p 19. 20.

5 That the circumcising of Infants, nor yet the Old Covenant hath no consequence to prove the baptising Infants. page, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29. 30. 33, 34.

6 That only baptising of beleevers is the meanes of constituting true visible Churches in the times of the Gospell. page, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.

7 That a Covenant allied to become one and anothers among themselves cannot be the forme of the visible Church. page, 43. to the end.

INFANTS BAPTIZING Proved lawfull by the SCRIPTVRES:

Objections againſt it reſolved and removed.

MAT. 18. 6.

Whoſoever ſhall offend a little child which beleeves in me, it were better for him that a mil-ſtone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the ſea.

Aug. 24. 1644. *Imprmiatur,*
JOHN WHITE.

LONDON,
Printed by *George Miller* dwelling in *Black-Friers*, 1644.